DE GRUYTER

Roger A. Bullard

THE HYPOSTASIS OF THE ARCHONS

PATRISTISCHE TEXTE UND STUDIEN

DE G

ROGER AUBREY BULLARD

THE HYPOSTASIS OF THE ARCHONS

PATRISTISCHE TEXTE UND STUDIEN

IM AUFTRAG DER

PATRISTISCHEN KOMMISSION

DER AKADEMIEN DER WISSENSCHAFTEN ZU GÖTTINGEN · HEIDELBERG · MÜNCHEN UND DER AKADEMIE DER WISSENSCHAFTEN UND DER LITERATUR ZU MAINZ

HERAUSGEGEBEN VON

K. ALAND UND W. SCHNEEMELCHER

BAND 10

WALTER DE GRUYTER & CO.

VORMALS G. J. GÖSCHEN'SCHE VERLAGSHANDLUNG · J. GUTTENTAG VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG
GEORG REIMER · KARL J. TRÜBNER · VEIT & COMP.

BERLIN 1970

THE HYPOSTASIS OF THE ARCHONS

THE COPTIC TEXT WITH TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

ROGER AUBREY BULLARD

WITH A CONTRIBUTION BY MARTIN KRAUSE

WALTER DE GRUYTER & CO.

VORMALS G. J. GÖSCHEN'SCHE VERLAGSHANDLUNG · J. GUTTENTAG, VERLAGSBUCHHANDLUNG
GEORG REIMER · KARL J. TRÜBNER · VEIT & COMP.

BERLIN 1970

Gedruckt mit Unterstützung der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft

©

1970 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., vormals G. J. Göschen'sche Verlagshandlung — J. Guttentag, Verlagsbuchhandlung — Georg Reimer — Karl J. Trübner — Veit & Comp., Berlin 30

Printed in Germany

Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es auch nicht gestattet, dieses Buch oder Teile daraus auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen

Satz und Druck: Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30

Archiv-Nr. 39 10 701

In memoriam
Kendrick Grobel
discipulus eius
hunc librum
dedicavit

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This most pleasant of tasks, the acknowledging of gratitude to those whose efforts and encouragement have facilitated a writer's work, must in this case be tinged with a note of sorrow, since Dr. Kendrick Grobel, under whose guidance this study was begun, did not live to see it to completion as an academic dissertation. Dr. Grobel was my teacher in Coptic, but the present work owes quite as much to his personal interest and encouragement. After his most unexpected death, Mrs. Grobel was her usual gracious self in allowing me continued access to her husband's library.

At considerable inconvenience to himself, Dr. R. McL. Wilson voluntarily assumed the responsibility of seeing the study through as a dissertation. To him I express my thanks.

A most extraordinary note of thanks is due to the Patristische Kommission, and to its personnel in Münster. Under its auspices the cost of publication has been underwritten, and its most careful attention at every stage has made this book possible. It is an especially great honor for Dr. Martin Krause to have agreed to supply an introduction to the linguistic aspects of the text, thus greatly amplifying the value of the publication.

Dr. B. Ehlers and H. U. Rosenbaum of Münster have made an essential contribution to the entire study by their exacting and tireless work in the checking of references to writers ancient and modern, and their reworking of the bibliography. I owe them my heartfelt thanks. And certainly not least, I am grateful for the attention and good advice of Dr. Kurt Aland.

Source material for this study has not always been readily available. In this regard I express my gratitude for the assistance of Miss Clara Brown and her staff at the Joint Universities Library, Miss Mary Bird of the Hardy Library of Atlantic Christian College, and Mr. E. C. Osburn of Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary. The Faculty Welfare Committee of Atlantic Christian College provided appreciated financial assistance during the preparation of the manuscript.

The whole of the work reflects the instruction and encouragement over many years of Dr. R. C. Briggs, and the concerned interest of my

parents. But of those to whom I express my thanks, none would expect least credit while deserving most than my wife Carol, of whom the words of Sirach 36:22—24 (RSV) must have been written.

These sources of help have greatly assisted this work, but the final responsibility for error rests with the author.

Wilson, North Carolina
September 15, 1968

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements VII
Table of Abbreviations XI
Introduction 1
Martin Krause: Die Sprache der Hypostase der Archonten 4
Text and Translation 19
Commentary 42
Introduction 42
Summary 49
The Reflection of Imperishability 55
The Archons Create Man 59
The Spirit Comes to Adam 67
Adam Names the Animals 71
Adam Placed in Paradise 72
The Archons Create Eve 74
Adam Greets Eve 80
The Archon's Lust for Eve 84
The Temptation and Fall 85
Cain and Abel 92
The Daughter of Eve 93
Noah and Norea 94
The Archon's Lust for Norea 99
Eleleth Answers Norea's Call 99
Norea's Description of Eleleth 100
Eleleth's Words of Comfort and Norea's Request for Instruction . 102
The Creation of Pistis Sophia 103
The Blasphemy of Samael 106
Samael Begets Offspring 107
The Punishment of Ialdabaoth 109
The Repentance of Sabaoth 110
The Glorification of Sabaoth 110
The Envy of Ialdabaoth 112
Eleleth's Reassurance 112
Conclusion 113

Conclusion 115
Concordance 117
Coptic words 117
Greek Words 121
Hebrew Words 123
Proper Names 123
Bibliography 124
Primary Sources 124
Grammatical and Lexicographical Studies 127
Other Secondary Sources 128
Correspondence 132

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS*

AA, *Apocalypse of Adam*, Codex V from Nag-Hammadi
AJ, *Apocryphon of John*
AJ II, *Apocryphon of John*, Codex II from Nag-Hammadi
AJ III, *Apocryphon of John*, Codex III from Nag-Hammadi
AJ IV, *Apocryphon of John*, Codex IV from Nag-Hammadi
AJ BG, *Apocryphon of John*, Papyrus Berolinensis 8502
I Apoc. Jac., *First Apocalypse of James*, Codex V from Nag-Hammadi
Apoc. Pl., *Apocalypse of Paul*, Codex V from Nag-Hammadi
EP, *The Gospel according to Philip*, Codex II from Nag-Hammadi
ET, *The Gospel according to Thomas*, Codex II from Nag-Hammadi
EV, *The Gospel of Truth*, Codex I from Nag-Hammadi
HA, *The Hypostasis of the Archons*, Codex II from Nag-Hammadi
PS, *Pistis Sophia*
SJC, *Sophia Jesu Christi*
UW, The untitled document of Codex II from Nag-Hammadi, "Ursprung der Welt"

* For all other abbreviations see "Verzeichnis der Abkürzungen" in: Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart 3rd edition, Tübingen, 1957 vol I, p. XVI—XXVII.

INTRODUCTION

Numbered as the fourth writing contained in Codex II of the Coptic Gnostic documents recovered from Nag-Hammadi[1], The Hypostasis of the Archons was first made available to the scholarly world by Pahor Labib's publication of a volume of photographic reproductions of the pages of a portion of the codex[2]. Since this represents the most convenient access to the Nag-Hammadi treatises contained therein, the pagination of Labib's book has been followed here. However, the edition here presented has made use of photographs of the manuscript, graciously loaned by Dr. Martin Krause of Münster.

A short document of 384 lines, The Hypostasis of the Archons has thus far not received a great deal of attention. Henri-Charles Puech and Jean Doresse have published surveys of the entire Nag-Hammadi discovery, which included a few pages relative to this document[3]. Other than a few fragments offered in translation as illustrative material to other studies[4], the only rendering of the treatise into a modern language is the German translation of Hans-Martin Schenke[5].

---

[1] The enumeration followed is that of M. Krause and P. Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band I, Wiesbaden 1962, pp. 7—27.

[2] Pahor Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, Cairo 1956.

[3] Henri-Ch. Puech, Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (premier inventaire et essai d'identification), in: Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum, Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute, Boston, 1950, pp. 220—222. Jean Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, trans. Philip Mairet, New York, pp. 159—165.

[4] J. Zandee, Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation, Numen 11 (1964), passim. A. Orbe, A propósito de Gen. 1, 3 (fiat lux) en la exegesis de Taciano, Gregorianum, 42 (1961), passim. C. J. De Catanzaro (trans.), The Gospel according to Philip, JThS 13 (1962), pp. 69—70. H. Jonas, Gnosis und spätantiker Geist, Teil I: Die mythologische Gnosis, 3. Aufl., FRLANT NF. 33 Göttingen, 1964, pp. 406—407; cited hereafter as Jonas, Gnosis. H. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion (2d ed. rev., Boston, 1963), pp. 302 to 303; cited hereafter as Jonas, Gnostic Religion.

[5] H.-M. Schenke (trans.), Das Wesen der Archonten: eine gnostische Originalschrift aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi, ThLZ 83 (1958), pp. 661—670. Reprinted in J. Leipoldt and H.-M. Schenke (trans.), Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi, Theologische Forschung, Veröffentlichung 20, Hamburg, 1960, pp. 67—78, 83—84. Page references to Schenke's work in this book are to the latter source.

Since The Hypostasis of the Archons, like most Gnostic literature, is of primary interest to the student, and is not likely to earn a place on prestigious library shelves nestling the literary classics of human history, the translation is accordingly prepared with the scholar in mind. At the expense of literary finesse and nicer turns of English idiom, the translator is presenting a very literal version, being careful to maintain the integrity of the original lineation.

The commentary is keyed to the text by page and line. The division of the commentary into sections with titles corresponds to nothing in the text itself, but is a device to facilitate reference and understanding.

The scope of the commentary embraces problems of content and of language. The disadvantages of combining linguistic and palaeographical commentary with remarks on the thought content of the document will be evident, but since in many places the two cannot be separated, one set of notes only is provided. Commentaries by their very nature do not lend themselves to graceful presentation, and with this thought in mind, the writer offers what he considers the most practical format for the study.

The purpose of these notes is to elucidate the meaning of the writing in its immediate context. Exhaustive lists of parallel references in related literature are not provided, nor is every historical and theological problem encountered thoroughly investigated. The intent has rather been to demonstrate the relations of this document, and suggest the areas of research that may be brought to bear upon it in studies of less comprehensive scope but of greater depth.

The most closely related literature is, of course, other Gnostic writings which have been published, as well as the accounts of the Gnostic sectarians given in the works of the great heresiologists of the early Church. Mandean and Manichean literature has been utilized here only where it offered some real elucidation of the text at hand. The problem posed by the relation of these Coptic Gnostic writings to the development of Mandean and Manichean religion is a large one, and the place for this study is in concentrated investigations directed precisely at that area. Discussion of the matter within the organization of a commentary would make for hopeless incoherence, nor would it always be directly relevant to the present text.

Something of the same situation holds in regard to the relations to Jewish literature, in particular, the literature of later Jewish mysticism. Scores of striking parallels can be adduced, but since they throw no light on the understanding of this document in its own historical context, they go uncited. The traditions of the rabbinic literature, however, are more relevant, since much of the tradition finding expression in the rabbinic writings is roughly contemporary with the Egyptian gnostics. Use has therefore been made of these sources, although the

writer must confess that the effective use of rabbinic material is hampered by his own lack of thorough acquaintance with its full range, and in some cases, by the inaccessibility of the material itself.

Matters pertaining to the palaeographic hand and the date of the manuscript have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere, in treatments of more familiar writings from Codex II, and need no repetition here[6]. Suffice it to say that the manuscript is from somewhere around 400 A. D., although the material contained in it, including parts of this document, may be older, perhaps much older.

From a literary point of view, The Hypostasis of the Archons gives the appearance of having been compiled from two or three sources, with editorial expansion by a Christian Gnostic. One of these sources is purely narrative in form and cosmological in concern, essentially a Gnostic interpretation of the first chapters of Genesis, with no evidence of Christian influence, save for an occasional gloss. The second main source is an apocalyptic writing in the form of question and answer. This section is concerned with eschatology and soteriology in a way that the first is not. The beginning and conclusion to the document are certainly from a Christian Gnostic, whose fondness for John and Ephesians is evident.

The material has to do with the origin and nature of the archontic powers peopling the heavens between Earth and the Ogdoad, and how the destiny of man is affected by these primeval happenings. It will be noticed that of the various Gnostic sects described by the Church Fathers, the Ophite groups seem to have a closer relation to the ideas of this treatise than do others, though on occasion notions distinctly Valentinian are evident.

The Ophite connections suggest a tradition of some age. The document shows some signs of stemming from a transitional period in Gnosticism, as it was coming out of a purely mythological stage and was beginning to recast in a philosophical manner the substance of its own traditions and of others not yet digested into its system. As the writing progresses, it is evident that all its parts are not on the same level of sophistication, and presumably, not of the same age.

---

[6] See especially S. Giversen (ed.), Apocryphon Johannis: the Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction, and Commentary, Acta Theologica Danica, Vol. 5, Copenhagen, 1963, pp. 19—45.

DIE SPRACHE DER HYPOSTASE DER ARCHONTEN[1]

Martin Krause

Die Hypostase der Archonten ist in Codex II[2] von Nag Hammadi enthalten. Die Seiten dieses Codex tragen keine Seitenzahlen. Zählt man die beschriebenen Seiten von Codex II, so nimmt diese Schrift die Seiten 86, 20—97, 23 ein. Sie ist von Pahor Labib auf Tafel 134 bis 145 seines Tafelbandes[3] abgebildet worden und wird seitdem nicht nach Seiten, sondern nach diesen Tafelnummern, so auch von uns zur Vermeidung von Verwirrung, zitiert. Die sieben in diesem Codex enthaltenen Traktate sind von demselben Schreiber etwa in der ersten Hälfte des 4. Jahrhunderts[4] geschrieben worden. Ihre Sprache ist ein Sahidisch, das eine Reihe von Abweichungen vom klassischen Sahidischen enthält. Diese Abweichungen vom Sahidischen sind sowohl in ihrem Umfang als auch in ihrer Art verschieden, und zwar sogar in den einzelnen Schriften desselben Codex, wie die bereits vorliegenden Untersuchungen der Sprache von fünf[5] der sieben Traktate in Codex II

---

[1] Vorliegende Untersuchung der Sprache der Hypostase der Archonten wurde auf Wunsch von Professor K. Aland nach meiner Textabschrift durchgeführt.

[2] Eine Beschreibung von Codex II findet sich bei M. Krause und P. Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band I, Wiesbaden 1962, S. 13ff. und bei S. Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis: the Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction, and Commentary, Acta Theologica Danica Vol. 5 Copenhagen 1963, S. 19ff.

[3] P. Labib, Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, Vol. I, Cairo 1956.

[4] Giversen a. O. 40 datiert die Handschrift zwischen 330 und 340.

[5] 1. des Apokryphon des Johannes in: M. Krause, Literarkritische Untersuchung des Apokryphon des Johannes, Habil.-Schrift Münster 1965 (Masch.-Schrift) S. 101ff. (erscheint in PTS). Dort wird auch die z. T. fehlerhafte Untersuchung von S. Giversen (a. O. 40ff.) verbessert.

2. des Philippusevangeliums in: W. C. Till, Das Evangelium nach Philippos, PTS 2, Berlin 1963, S. 5f.

3. der titellosen Schrift in: Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo herausgegeben, übersetzt und bearbeitet von A. Böhlig und P. Labib, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung Nr. 58, Berlin 1962, S. 15ff.

ergeben[6] haben. Die sprachlichen Unterschiede sind auf die Tätigkeit verschiedener Übersetzer zurückzuführen, deren Übersetzungen aus dem Griechischen von dem uns unbekannten Schreiber in diesem Codex vereinigt wurden. Daher muß die Sprache jeder einzelnen Schrift gesondert untersucht werden.

Unterschiede bestehen noch in der Benennung dieser sprachlichen Eigenheiten. Als einen neuen Dialekt hat zwar niemand diese Sprache bezeichnet, vielmehr wird sie als vorklassisches Sahidisch[7] oder als Sahidisch mit starkem Einschlag anderer Dialekte[8], aber als kein Mischdialekt charakterisiert, weil dieser nach Tills Definition[9] fremde Wortformen aufnehmen und konsequent verwenden müßte. Er meint (in bezug auf die Sprache von BP 8502) „das Schwanken zwischen saidischen und subachmimischen Wortformen zeigt, daß der Übersetzer bemüht war, ein reines Saidisch zu schreiben, bei einigen Wortformen aber — bewußt oder unbewußt — im Zweifel war, welche die richtige ist[10]". Bei unserer Untersuchung werden wir daher vor allem darauf achten müssen, ob die Abweichungen vom Sahidischen durchgängig neben den sahidischen Formen begegnen oder ob sie z. T. keine sahidischen Parallelen aufweisen. Auch orthographische Eigentümlichkeiten sollen genannt werden. Danach soll auch versucht werden, eine Definition dieser Sprache zu geben und die Ursache für diese sprachlichen Eigenheiten zu klären.

Bei der Bestimmung der Dialektformen wurden Crums Koptisches Wörterbuch[11] und z. T. auch Tills Koptische Dialektgrammatik[12] zugrunde gelegt. Durch die neugefundenen Handschriften, vor allem

---

4. der Exegese über die Seele und

5. des Thomasbuches in: M. Krause und P. Labib, Gnostische und hermetische Schriften aus Codex II und VI, ADIK, Koptische Reihe II, Wiesbaden 1970 (im Druck).

Die Sprache des Thomasevangeliums wird in der in Vorbereitung befindlichen großen Ausgabe des Thomasevangeliums behandelt werden (vgl. A. Guillaumont u. a., Evangelium nach Thomas, Leiden 1959, S. V; G. Garitte, Muséon 1957, S. 64 u. R. Haardt, WZKM 57, 1961, S. 98f.

[6] Vgl. Krause, Literarkritische Untersuchung S. 121ff.

[7] H.-M. Schenke in: J. Leipoldt u. H.-M. Schenke, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag Hamadi, Theologische Forschung, Veröffentlichung 20, Hamburg 1960 S. 33 u. 69 A. 1, Giversen a. O. 44.

[8] J. Leipoldt in: Leipoldt-Schenke a. O. 9; Till a. O. 5; Böhlig-Labib a. O. 15.

[9] W. C. Till, Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 = TU 60 Berlin 1955 S. 21.

[10] Till a. O. 21.

[11] W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, Oxford 1939 (wird nach Spalten zitiert).

[12] W. C. Till, Koptische Dialektgrammatik, München ^{2}1961 (wird nach Paragraphen zitiert).

der letzten beiden großen Handschriftenfunde[13], die Crum noch nicht kannte und die Till noch nicht in seiner Grammatik verarbeitet hat[14], ist die koptische Dialektkunde neu belebt worden[15], und die bisher geltenden Anschauungen müssen neu überdacht werden[16]. Jedoch erst nach der Publikation aller neugefundenen Handschriften können abschließende Urteile gefällt und bisherige Ansichten eventuell korrigiert werden. Bis dahin empfiehlt es sich, von Crums Dialekteinteilungen auszugehen und die neu bekanntgewordenen Formen in den Anmerkungen[17] zu berücksichtigen. Wir können unterscheiden

I. Abweichungen vom Sahidischen, die neben den sahidischen Formen vorkommen. Die neben den sahidischen Formen auftretenden Abweichungen vom Sahidischen lassen sich verschiedenen Dialekten zuweisen:

1. nur den oberägyptischen Dialekten (AA_2),
   a) dem Achmimischen (A):
      ⲘⲚ- (Negativer Imperativ, Till § 244) 138, 3 neben SAA_2 ⲘⲠⲢ- 136, 30; 138, 2. 4. 26[18],
   b) dem Subachmimischen (A_2):
      ⲀⲀⲒ- (Perf. I, Till § 262) 144, 15 neben SⲀⲒ- und ⲀⲈⲒ- passim[19]; (Ⲉ)ⲚⲦⲀⲀ - (Relativpronomen mit perfektischer Bedeu-

[13] Vgl. zuletzt M. Krause, Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi-Texte in: Studies in the History of Religions 12, Leiden 1967, S. 61ff. und M. Krause, Schätze aus dem zweiten großen Fund koptischer Handschriften in: OLZ 62, 1967, Sp. 437ff. (mit Lit.).

[14] Ein Teil ist nachgetragen in: R. Kasser, Compléments au dictionnaire copte de Crum, Bibliothèque d'études coptes tome VII, Le Caire 1964.

[15] P. Nagel, Der frühkoptische Dialekt von Theben in: Koptologische Studien in der DDR, Sonderheft der Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg 1965 S. 30ff.; R. Kasser, Dialectes, sous-dialectes, et „dialecticules" dans l'Egypte copte in: ZÄS 92, 1966, 106ff.; R. Kasser, Les dialectes coptes et les versions coptes bibliques in: Biblica 46, 1965, 287ff.; R. Kasser, L'Evangile selon Saint Jean et les versions coptes de la bible, Neuchâtel 1966, S. 7ff. (Dialectes coptes et versions coptes).

[16] Den Ausführungen von R. Kasser kann ich nicht in allen Punkten zustimmen.

[17] In den Anmerkungen wird zunächst verzeichnet, ob und wo dieselben Formen auch in den anderen Schriften von Codex II begegnen. Die sieben Schriften von Codex II werden abgekürzt als II, 1 (= Apokryphon Johannes), II, 2 (= Thomasevangelium), II, 3 (= Philippusevangelium), II, 4 (= Hypostase der Archonten), II, 5 (= Titellose Schrift), II, 6 (= Exegese über die Seele) und II, 7 (= Thomasbuch). II, 1, 6 und 7 werden nach Seiten des Codex, II, 2—5 nach den Tafeln entsprechend ihren Ausgaben (vgl. A. 5) zitiert. Außerdem wird vermerkt, ob Kasser in seinen Compléments weiteres Material bietet.

[18] Wechsel von ⲘⲚ (144, 4. 5.; 121, 30; 122, 11; 126, 21) und ⲘⲠⲢ- (104, 2; 106, 14) auch in II, 3.

[19] Wechsel von ⲀⲀⲒ-, ⲀⲒ- und ⲀⲈⲒ- auch in II, 5 (ⲀⲀⲒ- 162, 15; 167, 28; 168, 2) und II, 6 (ⲀⲀⲒ- [128, 36]; 129, 1; 137, 4. 18).

tung, Till § 351) 135, 16. 32; 136, 8; 137, 14. 17; 142, 18; 144, 25 neben dem Relativpronomen mit Perfekt I ⲚTA- (SA_2[F], Till § 347) 135, 5; 137, 6; 138, 28; 142, 1; 144, 3. 16. 20; 145, 3[20] (vgl. auch unten 2 f),

c) dem Achmimischen und Subachmimischen (AA_2):
ⲣ- vor griechischen Verben (Till § 187) 135, 3. 26. 30; 136, 1; 137, 23. 29; 138, 8; 139, 10. 10—11; 140, 3. 4. 19; 141, 1. 5; 142, 25. 32; 143, 7. 15—16. 17. 29—30; 145, 6 wird häufiger verwendet als ohne ⲣ (= S)[21] 135, 6. 8; 136, 7; 139, 21; 140, 29; 143, 15. 17. 20. 25; 144, 9. ⲘⲚⲦⲈ= (nicht haben, Till § 226) 142, 20; 145, 4 neben S ⲘⲚⲦⲀ= 142, 4; 145, 8 und der druckarmen Form ⲘⲚⲦⲞⲨ- 143, 29[22]. ⲁ- (Präposition, Till § 148) 135, 6. 11. 12 (bis). 35; 136, 8. 12. 15; 137, 19; 138, 17. 22; 139, 3. 8. 10; 140, 19; 141, 1. 2. 33; 142, 13. 19. 20. 32; 143, 2. 14. 33. 36; 144, 15. 19. 20 neben seltenerem S ϵ-[23] 135, 1; 140, 15; 141, 5 u. ö. ⲒⲚϵ (bringen, Crum 78 b) 142, 30 neben SA ϵⲒⲚϵ 137, 4; 139, 15—16. 17[24]. ⲒⲚϵ (Abbild, gleichen Crum 80 b) 135, 13. 15; 142, 8. 17 neben SA ϵⲒⲚϵ[25] 136, 8; 137, 26. 31; 141, 14. 17 und ⲱⲂⲢϵⲒⲚϵ 135, 35; 137, 19; 139, 31; 140, 25,

d) dem Achmimischen, Subachmimischen und achmimisch gefärbten Sahidisch (AA_2S^a):
ⲀⲦϵⲔⲞ (unvergänglich, Crum 405 a) 144, 22 (SB ⲀⲦⲦⲀⲔⲞ ist nicht belegt), ⲘⲚⲦⲀⲦⲦϵⲔⲞ 135, 11—12 neben SB ⲘⲚⲦⲀⲦ-ⲦⲀⲔⲞ 135, 1. 2. 20—21; 136, 18; 141, 29—30; 142, 5[26],

e) dem achmimisch gefärbten Sahidisch (S^a):
ϩⲀϵⲒⲂϵ (Schatten, Crum 657 b) 142, 13 neben S ϩⲀ(ϵ)ⲒⲂϵϹ 137, 26; 138, 32; 142, 11. 12. 16[27].

---

[20] Wechsel von (ϵ)NTAϩ- und ⲚTA- auch in II, 1 (Krause, Literarkritische Untersuchung 103), II, 3 (Till, Das Evangelium nach Philippos 83), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 17) und II, 6 (ⲓϵ] NTAϩ- 129, 5; 137, 2; 134, 19. 20. 21. 22; 135, 7).

[21] Ist im ganzen Codex II belegt: II, 1 (Krause a. O. 104), II, 2 (ⲣ- z. B. 81, 15. 17 — ohne ⲣ- 83, 7), II, 3 (Till a. O. 5), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 17), II, 6 und II, 7.

[22] Ebenso in II, 3 (Till a. O. 85).

[23] Dieser Wechsel ist im ganzen Codex II belegt.

[24] In Papyrus Bodmer VI (R. Kasser in: CSCO 194, 1960, 131) = P (vgl. Kasser a. O. 14 a) kommt nur die Schreibung ⲒⲚϵ vor.

[25] Auch in II, 1 (5mal ⲒⲚϵ, 1mal ϵⲒⲚϵ Krause a. O. 103), II, 3 (ⲒⲚϵ 109, 11; 126, 19 — ϵⲒⲚϵ 124, 8; 126, 13. 14. 15. 23. 24), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 111), vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 14 a.

[26] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 104), II, 3 (Till a. O. 87), II, 7 (passim), P hat durchgängig TϵKO, vgl. Kasser a. O. 63 b.

[27] Auch in II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 117), III, 1 (Krause und Labib, Die drei Versionen 276), vgl. Kasser a. O. 96 a.

2. den ober- (SAA_2) und unterägyptischen Dialekten (BF),
   a) dem Achmimischen, Subachmimischen und Fajumischen (AA_2F): ϩⲁϥ (Schlange, Crum 740 b) 137, 32; 138, 6. 11; 139, 3 neben SB ϩⲟϥ 138, 31. 32; 139, 1[28],
   b) dem Achmimischen, Subachmimischen und Bohairischen (AA_2B): MAϩ- (zur Bildung von Ordinalzahlen, Till § 107) 140, 18; 143, 33 neben SF Mⲉϩ- 143, 20[29],
   c) dem Achmimischen, Subachmimischen, Fajumischen und Bohairischen (AA_2FB):
   Tⲉ- (Possessivartikel, Till § 128) 140, 20. 31; 141, 13 neben S NOY- 144, 19. 21 (TOY- ist nicht belegt)[30],
   d) dem Achmimischen, Fajumischen und Bohairischen (AFB): Aϥ- (Präs. II 3. Pers. sg., Till § 248) 144, 30 (Schreibfehler?) neben SA_2 ⲉϥ-passim,
   e) dem Achmimischen und Bohairischen (AB):
   AϥNA- (Futur II 3. Pers. sg., Till § 252) 144, 29 (Schreibfehler?) neben SA_2 ⲉϥNA- 135, 35; 137, 1—2; 144, 14[31],
   f) dem Achmimischen, zuweilen auch Subachmimischen, Fajumischen und Bohairischen ($A[A_2]FB$):
   ⲉTA- (Relativpronomen mit Perfekt I, Till § 347) 138, 31 (Schreibfehler für ⲉTAϩ-?) neben SA_2 (F) ⲚTA-, (vgl. oben 1 b),
   g) dem Subachmimischen und Fajumischen (A_2F):
   TPOY- (kausativer Infinitiv 3. Pers. Pl., Till § 281) 143, 29 neben SA_2F (ⲉ)TPⲉϥ- 136, 23. 25 und TPⲉ- 140, 30[32],
   h) dem Subachmimischen, Fajumischen und Bohairischen (A_2 FB): ⲓ (kommen, Crum 70 a) 137, 12 neben SAA_2F ⲉⲓ 137, 18. 31[33],
3. den unterägyptischen Dialekten (BF):
   der bestimmte Artikel (Till § 64) ⲡⲓ- 136, 12; 142, 34; 143, 34 neben S ⲡ- 134, 20 u. ö., ϯ - 137, 31 neben S T- 134, 20 u. ö., Nⲓ- 135, 27; 138, 9; 141, 12; 145, 20 neben S N- 134, 20 u. ö.[34].

[28] Auch in II, 1 und III, 1 (Krause und Labib a. O. 278).

[29] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 107), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), vgl. Kasser a. O. 33 a.

[30] Auch in II, 6 (z. B. Nⲉ- 129, 14).

[31] Auch in II, 1 (APⲉ-NA 15, 4 — ⲈPⲉ - NA 15, 12).

[32] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 107), II, 6 (TPOY- 128, 22; ATPOY- 128, 6; ⲈTPOY- 136, 14; 137, 12; ⲈTPⲉϥ- 136, 25. 31), II, 7 (TPOY- 139, 37; ATPOY- 141, 35; ⲈTPⲈK-138, 11; ATPⲉ- 144, 6).

[33] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 83), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 111), II, 6 (ⲓ 127, 26; 129, 5; 135, 7. 23 — ⲉⲓ 131, 8; 132, 9. 25; 135, 1), vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 13 a.

[34] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 109), II, 7, III, 1 (Krause a. O. 62), IV, 1 (Krause a. O. 129), BG, Chester Beatty 1389 und anderen früheren Codices.

II. Abweichungen vom Sahidischen ohne sahidische Parallelen. Auch die Abweichungen vom Sahidischen, die keine sahidischen Parallelen in dieser Schrift besitzen, lassen sich wieder verschiedenen Dialekten zuweisen:

1. nur den oberägyptischen Dialekten (AA_2),
   a) dem Achmimischen (A):
      CЄϩω= (entfernen, Crum 380 a) 141, 7[35], TЄNЄ- (vollbringen, Crum 418 b) 142, 7, TЄϩЄ- (fassen, Crum 455 a) 135, 15. 18[36],
   b) dem Subachmimischen (A_2):
      ЄMAϩTЄ (ergreifen, Crum 9 a) 136, 1[37], KOYЄI (klein, Crum 92 b) 140, 13[38],
   c) dem Achmimischen und Subachmimischen (AA_2):
      in der Präfixkonjugation sind von folgenden Tempora immer nur die achmimisch-subachmimischen Formen belegt
      α) dem Temporalis (Till § 265) ⲚTAPЄ- 144, 3; ⲚTAPЄϤ- 134, 31; 137, 13; 140, 8—9; 142, 22; 143, 14; ⲚTAPOY- 137, 18 bis 19[39],
      β) dem negativen Präsens consuetudinis (Till § 250) MAϤ- 140, 11[40],
      γ) dem Konditionalis (Till § 334) ЄPⲱA- 144, 33[41], ebenso beim Imperativ von ЄIPЄ: ЄPI- (Till § 236) 141, 1[42] und einigen Wörtern: CЄϩω= (setzen, Crum 380 b) 140, 13[43], TЄΛO (einschiffen, Crum 408 a) 140, 15[44], OYЄN (öffnen, Crum 482 b) 137, 7; 138, 8—9. 16; 142, 19[45],

[35] Auch in II, 1 (23, 36 neben CЄϩωω= 10, 22), II, 3 (102, 26), P, vgl. Kasser a. O. 60 a.

[36] Vgl. Kasser a. O. 70 b.

[37] Auch in II, 1 (dort ebenso wie in II, 3 [Till a. O. 83], III, 1 und IV, 1 — neben AMAϩTЄ, vgl. Krause und Labib a. O. 257 und 258), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 110), vgl. Kasser a. O. 2 a.

[38] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 84), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 111), II, 6 (134, 24: ⲘⲚTKOYЄI), vgl. Kasser a. O. 17 a.

[39] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 104), II, 3 (Till a. O. 5), II, 6 und II, 7; in II, 5 überwiegen die AA_2-Formen gegenüber den sahidischen (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16).

[40] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 104), II, 3 (Till, a. O. 5), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), II, 6 (128, 12;) und II, 7 (139, 33; 142, 35; 143, 5).

[41] In II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), II, 6 und II, 7 schwankt der Gebrauch zwischen ⲱAN und ⲱA.

[42] Auch in II, 2 (z. B. 83, 23), II, 3 (Till a. O. 84), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 111) und II, 6 (134, 17. 19).

[43] Auch in II, 1 (Krause und Labib a. O. 268), II, 3 (Till a. O. 87), vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 60 a.

[44] Auch in II, 2 (89, 13; 91, 26) und II, 3 (Till a. O. 87), vgl. Kasser a. O. 64 a.

[45] In II, 3 (Till a. O. 88) und II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 115) wechseln OYⲰN und OYЄN.

d) dem achmimisch gefärbten Sahidisch (S^a):
ⲦⲉϩⲞ= (fassen, Crum 455 a) 135, 34[46],

2. den oberägyptischen (AA_2) und unterägyptischen (BF) Dialekten: der Possessivartikel der 3. Pers. Pl. ist immer AA_2B (Till § 128) ⲠⲞⲨ- 134, 27; 135, 31; 137, 18. 30; 139, 4; 140, 20; 141, 32; 143, 4; 144, 17 (bis); 145, 12. 13[47], ⲦⲞⲨ- 135, 17; 136, 3. 6; 137, 24. 25; 138, 15. 16. 19; 142, 2; 144, 3. 19; 145, 15[48], ⲚⲞⲨ- 137, 3. 21; 139, 9; 140, 5. 9; 141, 2; 144, 11; 145, 10. 11. 12[49],

3. den unterägyptischen Dialekten (BF):
ⲥⲱϥ (Besudelung, Crum 378 b) 137, 28[50].

Außerdem enthält diese Schrift noch Wörter, die Crum in diesen Schreibungen und Formen noch nicht kannte. Einige von ihnen können inzwischen in neugefundenen Texten nachgewiesen werden. Dazu gehören: ⲥⲟⲉⲓⲛ als Femininum in der Bedeutung „Ärztin" 137, 16, belegt auch in II, 5 (162, 10)[51], ⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟ= „belehren" 144, 15, belegt auch in II, 1 (1, 3 u. ö.), II, 2 (86, 4; 93, 17), II, 5 (164, 22; 166, 15) und in P_0 [52] und ⲣ̄ⲭⲟⲗⲉⲥ „morsch werden" 140, 11, bisher nur bei Horner in Mt 6, 19 belegt[53]. Außerhalb dieser Schrift kommen nicht vor (auch bei Kasser fehlen Belege): ⲙⲟⲩⲟⲩⲅ „Gestalt" 142, 14; ⲥϩⲟⲩⲟⲣ- 138, 30 und ⲥⲟⲩϩⲱⲣ- 138, 32 „verfluchen"; ⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉ= „belehren" 141, 33; ⲉϩⲣⲉ- „in" 140, 16 und ϩⲁⲧⲣ- „verbinden" 135, 22—23.
Selten belegt ist die Schreibung ⲛⲟⲩⲭ „werfen" (SB: Crum 247 a) 139, 7 neben der geläufigeren Schreibung ⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ 135, 4; 137, 22; 144, 30; 145, 5.
Außer den unter I und II genannten Abweichungen von den klassischen sahidischen Formen, die sich auch in anderen koptischen Dialekten nachweisen lassen, finden wir noch eine Reihe von orthographischen Eigentümlichkeiten. Auch diese könnten teilweise auf den Einfluß nicht - sahidischer Dialekte zurückzuführen sein. Wir finden

[46] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 88). In II, 1 wechseln ⲦⲀϩⲞ und ⲦⲉϩⲞ (vgl. Krause und Labib a. O. 271), vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 70 b.

[47] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 5), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), II, 6 und II, 7; in II, 1 wechseln ⲠⲞⲨ- und ⲠⲈⲨ-.

[48] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 5), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), II, 6 und II, 7; in II, 1 wechseln ⲦⲞⲨ- und ⲦⲈⲨ-.

[49] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 5), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16); in II, 1, II, 6 und II, 7 wechseln ⲚⲞⲨ- und ⲚⲈⲨ-

[50] Vgl. Kasser a. O. 59b.

[51] Vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 55a.

[52] Vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 68a.

[53] Vgl. auch Kasser a. O. 107a.

diese Abweichungen von klassischen sahidischen Texten vor allem noch in anderen frühen sahidischen Handschriften. Der Untersuchung weiterer früher Handschriften in sahidischem Dialekt muß vorerst die Lösung dieser Frage überlassen werden.

III. Orthographische Eigentümlichkeiten
Dazu gehören:

1. der Wechsel von Konsonanten.
   Neben der normalen Schreibung von ⲔⲈ „anderer" 140, 31 findet sich zweimal die Schreibung ϬⲈ (142, 22. 27)[54]. Das griechische Lehnwort ἵνα wird nicht ϩⲒⲚⲀ, sondern immer ⲱⲒⲚⲀ[55] (135, 22; 137, 29; 139, 9; 144, 13—14) geschrieben.

2. Defektiv- und Pleneschreibungen.
   Der unbestimmte Artikel des Plurals ϩⲈⲚ wird immer defektiv ϩⲚ[56] geschrieben (z. B. 135, 18; 138, 18; 139, 8 [bis]; 143, 2. 28. 30 [bis]), ebenso der Possessivartikel der 1. Person Pluralis ⲠⲚ̄[57] statt ⲠⲈⲚ- (134, 23; 135, 34; 136, 1; 137, 22). Die anderen Formen des Possessivartikels, z. B. der 3. Person Singularis ⲦⲈϤ- (134, 28), sind in der Normalschreibung belegt. Die Schreibung des bestimmten Artikels des Singulars vor Doppelkonsonanz wechselt[58]. Neben der vollen Form ⲠⲈ und ⲦⲈ lautet er zuweilen defektiv Ⲡ und Ⲧ: ⲠⲈⲤⲚⲞϤ 139, 25; ⲠⲈⲤⲠⲈⲢⲘⲀ 144, 27 aber ⲠⲠⲚⲀ̄ 134, 20; 136, 13; ⲦⲈⲤⲘⲎ 139, 25 aber ⲦⲤⲪⲢⲀⲄⲒⲤ 137, 28. In der Präfixkonjugation findet sich die volle Form ⲱⲀⲚⲦⲈϤ-[59] (statt ⲱⲀⲚⲦϤ-) 139, 2.
   Die griechischen Lehnwörter παράδεισος und πνεῦμα werden manchmal mit und manchmal ohne Artikel geschrieben: παράδεισος mit Artikel: 136, 25; 139, 4[60], ohne Artikel: 136, 28[61], πνεῦμα mit Artikel: 134, 20; 139, 11; 141, 6. 10, ohne Artikel: 144, 24; 145, 16[62].

---

[54] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 115), II, 3 (Till a. O. 84).

[55] Auch in II, 3 (Till a. O. 6 und 94: Ausnahme 100, 16: ϩⲒⲚⲀ), II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 15 und 121), II, 6 (130, 34; 133, 14).

[56] Auch in II, 6; in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 116) und II, 7 wechseln ϩⲈⲚ- und ϩⲚ-.

[57] Auch in II, 5 (Böhlig und Labib a. O. 16), II, 6 (131, 9), II, 7 (139, 20; 142, 20).

[58] Auch in allen anderen Schriften des Codex.

[59] Auch in II, 7 (141, 14—15), allerdings neben ⲱⲀⲚϤ- (144, 34).

[60] Auch in II, 1 (24, 7) und II, 5 (158, 2. 10; 163, 29; 167, 21; 169, 1; 171, 1).

[61] Auch in II, 1 (21, 18. 25—26) und II, 5 (158, 24. 32; 166, 19; 167, 25; 170, 1).

[62] Auch in II, 1 (5, 7. 14; 29, 28), II, 3 (117, 5) und II, 6 (135, 6), an den anderen Stellen hat ⲠⲚⲀ̄ immer den Artikel. ⲠⲚⲀ hat in II, 5 immer den Artikel. Dafür fehlt bei ⲠⲚⲈⲨⲘⲀⲦⲒⲔⲞⲤ zweimal der Artikel (170, 8. 14), einmal kommt es mit Artikel vor (165, 29).

Außerdem wechselt bei den griechischen Lehnwörtern die Schreibung von ⲓ und ⲉⲓ[63]. Neben den Normalschreibungen von ⲁⲇⲓⲕⲓⲁ (141, 7; 144, 2) und ⲃⲟⲏⲑⲓⲁ (136, 18) finden wir Pleneschreibungen dieser und anderer Wörter: ⲁⲇⲓⲕⲉⲓⲁ (141, 1—2), ⲃⲟⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ (140, 1), ⲁⲩⲑⲉⲛⲧⲉⲓⲁ (142, 24), ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲅⲉⲓⲛⲱⲥⲕⲉ (143, 15—16).

Auch bei koptischen Wörtern wechselt die Schreibung von ⲓ und ⲉⲓ. Neben die Normalschreibung ⲓ tritt oft die volle Form ⲉⲓ, u. zw. sowohl nach Vokalen als auch nach Konsonanten. Meist überwiegt die volle Form.

a) Nach Vokalen:

ⲡⲁⲓ (Demonstrativpronomen)[64] 135, 20; 136, 33 neben ⲡⲁⲉⲓ 134, 31; 137, 1; 138, 7; 142, 23; 144, 7,

ⲧⲁⲓ (nicht belegt) aber ⲧⲁⲉⲓ 137, 6; 140, 2; 142, 5,

ⲛⲁⲓ 139, 11 neben ⲛⲁⲉⲓ 136, 10. 12; 141, 21; 143, 26; 144, 11. 26,

ⲡⲉⲓ- (Demonstrativartikel)[65] 144, 4 neben ⲡⲉⲉⲓ- 134, 32; 144, 5; 145, 9,

ⲧⲉⲓ- 144, 25 neben ⲧⲉⲉⲓ- 137, 1,

ⲛⲉⲓ- (nicht belegt) aber ⲛⲉⲉⲓ- 141, 23. 27 (bis). 33—34,

ⲕⲁⲓⲛ (Eigenname)[66] 139, 20 u. ö. neben ⲕⲁⲉⲓⲛ 139, 28,

und in den Formen der Suffixkonjugation[67]:

Perfekt I ⲁⲓ- 139, 32 neben ⲁⲉⲓ- 138, 22. 23. 31; 144, 17—18,

b) nach Konsonanten:

ϥⲓ 138, 11. 18; 139, 4 neben ϥⲉⲓ 136, 24,

ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ- 135, 14 neben ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲓⲧ- 137, 21[68].

Neben dem Wechsel von ⲓ und ⲉⲓ findet sich durchgängig[69] die volle Form, u. zw. auch wieder nach einem Vokal und nach einem Konsonanten.

---

[63] Auch in II, 1 (Krause a. O. 116), II, 3 (z. B. von ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲓⲛⲟⲥ ist nur einmal die Normalschreibung ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲓⲛⲟⲛ (109, 14) belegt, sonst immer die Pleneschreibung), II, 5 (z. B. von ⲁⲇⲓⲕⲓⲁ, vgl. Böhlig und Labib a. O. 120), II, 6 (z. B. von ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ II 132, 31—32 und 134, 23—24) und II, 7 (z. B. von ⲉⲡⲓⲑⲩⲙⲓⲁ II 140, 3. 25. 32; 141, 32).

[64] In allen Schriften von Codex II sind die vollen Formen des Demonstrativpronomens nachweisbar.

[65] Auch beim Demonstrativartikel sind die vollen Formen in allen Schriften von Codex II nachweisbar.

[66] Auch in II, 6 wechselt die Schreibung ⲁⲫⲣⲟⲇⲓⲧⲏ 137, 2 und ⲁⲫⲣⲟⲇⲉⲓⲧⲏ 137, 7.

[67] Ebenso in allen sieben Schriften von Codex II.

[68] Auch in II, 5 (ⲙⲉⲣⲓⲧ= 156, 15; 157, 10; 167, 9 — ⲙⲉⲣⲉⲓⲧ= 161, 2).

[69] Die in der Hypostase der Archonten durchgängig plene geschriebenen Formen der Präpositionen und in der Konjugation sind auch in den übrigen Schriften von Codex II belegt, jedoch nicht durchgängig plene geschrieben. Auch in den Papyri Bodmer findet sich ⲉⲓ nach einem Vokal, z. B. in P. Bodmer XXIII.

a) nach einem Vokal:
bei den Präpositionen NAЄI „mir" 137, 14; 138, 28. 29; 140, 31; 141, 1. 18; 142, 2. 28; 144, 33, ЄPOЄI „zu mir" 139, 26, M̄MOЄI „mich" 138, 31,
bei dem Verbum: ANAЄI 140, 4[70] und
in den Formen der 1. Pers. Singularis der Suffix- (ΠЄXAЄI 144, 31) und der Präfixkonjugation:
NЄЄI- (Imperfekt) (138, 23), ЄЄI- (Präsens II) (139, 23),

b) nach einem Konsonanten:
KЄIM 136, 17 (war bisher noch nicht belegt).

3. Verdoppelung von Konsonanten.
Zuweilen wird N vor einem Vokal oder Konsonanten im Wortanlaut verdoppelt[71]. Vor A: 139, 19, vor I: 142, 8. 17, vor OY: 135, 25. 29; 137, 8. 9; 138, 5; 139, 17; 140, 6. 10 (bis); 142, 15 (bis); 144, 34; 145, 17, vor K: 139, 20, vor P: 140, 4. Auch Verdoppelung einzelner Konsonanten begegnet: Verdoppelung des M: 135, 12—13. 13—14. 16. 33; 136, 9. 11—12; 145, 4 und des B: 135, 4; 142, 26.

4. Assimilation des N.
Während N vor M immer zu M assimiliert[72] (z. B. 135, 12. 21; 141, 29), assimiliert es vor Π, P, Φ und Ψ nur manchmal, manchmal aber nicht:
vor Π: ΠMΠΛACMA 136, 1 aber ϩIϪN ΠKAϩ 139, 30,
vor P: PPωMЄ 139, 7; 140, 2; 144, 27 aber ϪIN PωMЄ 140, 7,
vor Φ: ϪIM ΦOOY 138, 34, MΦAϤ 138, 11, M̄ΦYΛAϨ 139, 24, M̄ΦωCTHP 141, 20 aber ЄϪN̄ ΦAϤ 139, 3,
vor Ψ: ϩM̄ ΨAΛTHPION 143, 30, M̄ΨYXIKOC 135, 17; 136, 4; 137, 10; 138, 15 aber N̄ΨYXIKOC 136, 12.

5. Kontraktion von T und ϩ zu Θ und Π und ϩ zu Φ.
Folgen T und ϩ aufeinander, werden sie immer zu Θ kontrahiert[73]: ΘYΛH 142, 15. 19. 31. 34; 143, 17; 144, 16; ΘYΠOCTACIC 134, 20. 26; NЄΘHΠ 135, 11; ΠЄΘOOY 136, 30; 138, 1. 10; ΘAЄIBЄC 142, 12. 16; ΘAЄIBЄ 142, 13; N̄ΘЄ 136, 7; 137, 8; 138, 9 u. ö.

---

[70] Auch in II, 5 (162, 19).

[71] Verdoppelung des N vor einzelnen Vokalen oder Konsonanten im Wortanlaut findet sich in allen Schriften von Codex II (vgl. die Sprachuntersuchung der einzelnen Schriften).

[72] Assimilation des N vor M, Π, P, Φ, Ψ und manchmal auch vor B, Λ, und P, findet sich in vielen Schriften von Codex II, jedoch bestehen Unterschiede zwischen den einzelnen Schriften (vgl. Krause a. O. 122f. und die Sprachuntersuchung der einzelnen Schriften).

[73] Auch die Kontraktion von T und ϩ zu Θ und Π und ϩ zu Φ ist in Codex II nachweisbar (vgl. die Sprachuntersuchung der einzelnen Schriften).

Außerdem wird zuweilen noch das T vor Ⲧϩ = Θ doppelt geschrieben[74]:
ⲘⲚⲦⲀⲦⲐⲎⲦ 137, 24—25; ⲦⲐⲨⲠⲞⲤⲦⲀⲤⲒⲤ 145, 22.
Folgen Π und ϩ aufeinander, werden sie bei ϩⲞⲘ und ϩⲀⲘ immer zu ΦⲞⲘ (138, 32; 139, 1) bzw. ΦⲀⲘ (137, 32; 138, 6. 11; 139, 3) kontrahiert, bei ϩⲞⲞⲨ nur manchmal (ΦⲞⲞⲨ 136, 31; 138, 34 aber ⲠϩⲞⲞⲨ 138, 4).

Schließlich sei noch darauf hingewiesen, daß der Schreiber N am Ende der Zeile zuweilen durch einen über dem letzten Buchstaben der Zeile bis in den rechten Blattrand hinausragenden Strich wiedergegeben hat[75] (136, 27; 138, 13; 140, 2; 141, 22; 142, 9) und bei der Niederschrift bzw. Abschrift des Textes eine Reihe von Fehlern gemacht hat[76]. Mehrfach hat er bemerkt, daß er Buchstaben ausgelassen hat und trug diese über der Zeile nach: Y von ⲈϩⲞⲨⲚ 141, 23, A von ⲀⲀⲆⲀⲘ 137, 10, ⲠⲘ von ⲠⲘⲠⲖⲀⲤⲘⲀ 136, 1. 137, 2 hat er fälschlich geschriebenes ⲰⲠ durchgestrichen und in ⲚⲀⲨ über der Zeile verbessert.

Häufiger hat er Fehler nicht bemerkt: Dittographie des Π in ⲘⲠⲠⲈⲢⲒⲤⲠⲀⲤⲘⲞⲤ 139, 8, Metathese des ϩ 143, 8 ⲞⲨϩⲰⲘ statt ⲞⲨⲰϩⲘ, Haplographie des N in ⲚⲈϮⲞⲨⲤⲒⲀ (139, 1 und 144, 31) und in ⲚⲞⲨⲰⲞϪⲚⲈ (140, 9), des Ⲓ oder ⲈⲒ in ⲚⲦⲀⲈⲒ (140, 26). Er hat nicht nur einzelne Buchstaben ausgelassen (ϩ von ⲞⲨⲰⲚϩ 135, 16, Ⲏ von ⲦⲎⲢⲎ 135, 27, N von ⲚⲰⲢⲈⲀ 140, 14), sondern ganze Wörter (ⲠⲈ nach ⲠⲞⲨⲀ 135, 5, ϪⲈ vor ϩⲢⲀⲒ 142, 4, ⲠⲈϪⲀⲎ ⲚⲀⲒ ϪⲈ vor ⲚⲦⲞ 144, 19), ja mindestens eine ganze Zeile 143 zwischen Zeile 25 und 26. Übersehen hat er auch, daß er 139, 12 ⲠⲞⲨⲰⲎⲢⲈ statt ⲠⲈⲤⲰⲎⲢⲈ geschrieben hat. Wir dürfen allerdings die Möglichkeit nicht ausschließen, daß diese Fehler bereits seiner Vorlage entstammen.

Nach der Sammlung und Darstellung der sprachlichen und orthographischen Eigenheiten dieser Schrift soll nun eine Definition dieser Sprache versucht und die Ursache für diese sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten bestimmt werden. Vergleicht man zunächst einmal den Umfang der sahidischen Formen mit dem der Abweichungen vom Sahidischen, so wird deutlich, daß diese Abweichungen nur einen geringen Prozentsatz des Wortschatzes des Traktates ausmachen. Von den oben festgestellten abweichenden Formen[77] kommen außerdem etwa

---

[74] Auch in P, vgl. Nagel a. O. 41 und A. 16.

[75] Ebenso in allen anderen Schriften von Codex II (vgl. die einzelnen Textausgaben).

[76] Auch bei der Niederschrift der anderen Traktate von Codex II (vgl. die Textausgaben und Sprachuntersuchungen von Codex II).

[77] Vgl. oben Absatz I und II.

zwei Drittel[78] neben den sahidischen Formen vor und nur zu etwa einem Drittel[79] fehlen sahidische Parallelen. Es überwiegen also bei weitem die sahidischen Formen. Das berechtigt uns, diese Sprache als überwiegend Sahidisch mit wenigen Abweichungen vom Sahidischen zu bezeichnen.

Es gilt nun noch festzustellen, wie häufig die einzelnen, vom Sahidischen abweichenden Formen konsequent verwendet werden. Dabei zeigt sich, daß in den meisten Fällen diese Wörter nur ein- bis zweimal in unserer Schrift vorkommen[80]. Nun zählt dieser Traktat mit reichlich 11 Seiten zu den kürzesten Schriften von Codex II. Erreichte er die Länge des Johannesapokryphons oder des Philippusevangeliums, so bestünde die Möglichkeit, daß die jetzt nur einmal belegten Wörter öfter vorkämen. Fraglich wäre, ob diese Wörter dann immer in den vom Sahidischen abweichenden Formen verwendet würden. Diese Überlegungen, die von der sprachlichen Untersuchung anderer und längerer Nag Hammadi-Schriften ausgehen, legen es uns nahe, nur die mehrfach verwendeten Wörter als sichere Kriterien anzusehen. Dazu gehören die immer gleichlautenden Formen des Temporalis, der Possessivartikel der 3. Person Pluralis, die Wörter ⲧⲉϩⲉ- bzw. ⲧⲉϩⲟ- und ⲟⲩⲉⲛ. Damit schrumpft die Anzahl der konsequent verwendeten Abweichungen vom Sahidischen weiter zusammen. Wir müssen daher die Sprache der Hypostase der Archonten als sahidischen Dialekt bezeichnen, der neben den sahidischen Formen sowohl einige vom Sahidischen abweichenden Formen als auch — noch seltener — vom Sahidischen abweichenden Formen ohne sahidische Parallelen verwendet.

Kann man diese sprachlichen Eigenheiten als Mischdialekt bezeichnen? Tills Definition eines Mischdialektes wird dem sprachlichen Material in unserer Schrift nicht gerecht. Wir stellten ja sowohl Abweichungen vom Sahidischen neben den sahidischen Formen fest, also Fälle, in denen der Übersetzer nach Till nicht sicher war, welche Formen sahidische waren und welche nicht, als auch immer verwendete Abweichungen vom Sahidischen ohne sahidische Parallelen. Die konsequente Verwendung dieser Abweichungen würde nach Tills Definition die Bezeichnung „Mischdialekt" rechtfertigen. Der geringe Umfang dieser konsequent verwendeten Abweichungen vom Sahidischen legt es aber nahe, die Bezeichnung „Mischdialekt" zu vermeiden und dafür den Terminus „Dialekteinschlag" zu gebrauchen.

Welchen Dialekten gehören diese Abweichungen an? Wie wir sahen, ließen sich die Abweichungen jeweils in drei Gruppen einteilen, von

---

[78] Vgl. oben Absatz I.

[79] Vgl. oben Absatz II.

[80] Vgl. oben Absatz II.

denen die erste immer die größte war[81], gefolgt von der zweiten[82]. Am kleinsten war die dritte[83] Gruppe, die Formen enthielt, die nur den unterägyptischen Dialekten eigentümlich waren. Diese früher nur in den unterägyptischen Dialekten, dem Bohairischen und Fajumischen, nachweisbaren Wortformen sind aber inzwischen auch in anderen frühen sahidischen Handschriften nachgewiesen worden und können daher auch als frühes Sahidisch erklärt werden[84]. Dasselbe gilt für etwa die Hälfte der bei Crum noch nicht belegten Wörter, die inzwischen auch in anderen frühen sahidischen Manuskripten vorkommen[85]. Damit bleiben nur noch die ersten beiden Gruppen übrig. Nun sind die in der zweiten Gruppe[86] enthaltenen Formen sowohl in den oberägyptischen als auch den unterägyptischen Dialekten belegt. Da der Einfluß der unterägyptischen Dialekte nachweisbar nicht vorliegt[87], müssen wir wohl diese als Eigenheiten der oberägyptischen Dialekte bezeichnen. Eine weitere Einengung auf das Achmimische oder Subachmimische ist z. Z. noch nicht möglich. Die meisten Formen sind sowohl im Achmimischen als auch im Subachmimischen[88] belegt, außerdem kommen einige Wörter vor, die bisher in dieser Schreibung nur im Achmimischen[89] oder nur im Subachmimischen[90] nachweisbar sind. Die geltende und wohl richtige Lokalisierung der koptischen Dialekte, nach der an das Sahidische im Süden das Subachmimische anschließt und an dieses wiederum im Süden das Achmimische[91], legt die Annahme nahe, daß die Dialekteinschläge in das Sahidische auf das benachbarte Subachmimische zurückzuführen sind. Hinzu kommt, daß das Subachmimische seinerseits keine feste Größe ist, sondern wieder in Unterdialekte[92] zerfällt. Somit könnten die Abweichungen vom Sahidischen als Einschlag eines subachmimischen Unterdialektes erklärt werden. Auch das Vorkommen eines subachmimischen Unterdialektes in Codex I, X und der 1. Hälfte von Codex XI von Nag Ham-

---

[81] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 1 und II, 1.

[82] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 2 und II, 2.

[83] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 3 und II, 3.

[84] Vgl. A. 34 und A. 50 sowie P. E. Kahle, Bala'izah I, London 1954, S. 91.

[85] Vgl. oben und A. 51—53.

[86] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 2 und II, 2.

[87] Die Gruppen I, 3 und II, 3 können ja als frühe sahidische Formen erklärt werden.

[88] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 1 c, d, 2 a, b, c, f; II, 1 c u. 2.

[89] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 1 a; II, 1 a.

[90] Vgl. oben Absatz I, 1 b; II, 1 b.

[91] W. H. Worrell, Coptic Sounds, Ann Arbor 1934, S. 63ff.; W. C. Till, Koptische Grammatik, Leipzig ^{3}1966, S. 36.

[92] Vgl. Kahle a. O. I 206ff.; E. Edel, Neues Material zur Herkunft der auslautenden Vokale -ϵ und -ι im Koptischen in: ZÄS 86, 1961, 103ff.

madi — die Sprache von Codex XI ist bekanntlich in der ersten Hälfte subachmimisch und in der zweiten sahidisch mit oberägyptischen Dialekteinschlägen[93] — spricht für diese Vermutung. Ebenso weist die Sprache von BP 8502[94], die ein frühes Sahidisch mit vor allem subachmimischen Einschlägen ist, in diese Richtung. Abschließende Urteile lassen sich freilich erst dann fällen, wenn die Sprache der vielen alten subachmimischen Handschriften genauer untersucht sein wird[95]. Für den jetzigen Zeitpunkt bleibt die Feststellung, daß der in unserer Schrift nachweisbare Dialekteinschlag dem Achmimischen und Subachmimischen eigentümlich ist.

Wie ist dieser Dialekteinschlag nun zu erklären? Es gibt hierfür zwei Erklärungsmöglichkeiten. Till[96] nahm an, daß dem Übersetzer „das Subachmimische, und zwar in der Mundart der manichäischen Bücher, geläufig (war), entweder als Muttersprache oder als Umgangssprache". Der Schreiber hat sich — nach Tills Meinung — bemüht, „ein reines Saidisch zu schreiben, war bei einigen Wortformen aber — bewußt oder unbewußt — im Zweifel, welche die richtige ist"[97].

Der Tatbestand könnte auch anders erklärt werden. Man muß zur Erklärung der Abweichungen vom Sahidischen nicht unbedingt davon ausgehen, daß die Mutter- oder Umgangssprache des Übersetzers eine andere war als die Sprache, in die er übersetzte. Vielmehr muß auch mit der Möglichkeit gerechnet werden, daß die Mutter- oder Umgangssprache des Übersetzers identisch war mit der Sprache, in die er übersetzte, d. h. die Umgangssprache wurde durch seine Übersetzung zur Literatursprache. Die Umgangssprache des Übersetzers, der an der Grenze des Sahidischen zum subachmimischen Sprachgebiet lebte, war kein reines Sahidisch, sondern wies Dialekteinschläge des Nachbardialektes auf.

Diese Sprache kann man deshalb auch als vorklassisch bezeichnen, weil sowohl die Übersetzung als auch die Niederschrift[98] dieser Schrift in eine Zeit vor der Standardisierung des sahidischen Dialektes[99] fällt. Bei der Standardisierung des Sahidischen wurde dieses dann von Dialekteinschlägen gereinigt und ergab dann das klassische Sahidisch, das wir in den sahidischen Handschriften nach dem 5. Jahrhundert finden und auf denen unsere sahidischen Grammatiken basieren.

---

[93] Vgl. M. Krause, Zum koptischen Handschriftenfund bei Nag Hammadi in: MDIK 19, 1963, 111 und 113.

[94] Vgl. W. C. Till, Die gnostischen Schriften, S. 11ff.

[95] Eine Grammatik des Subachmimischen erwarten wir von P. Nagel.

[96] Till a. O. 21.

[97] Till a. O. 21.

[98] Die Niederschrift dieses Traktates ist zwischen 330 und 340 zu setzen, vgl. oben A. 4.

[99] Zur Standardisierung des Sahidischen vgl. Kahle, a. O. 260ff.

20 ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛ̄ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲥⲙ̄ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ
21 ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ ⲁⲫⲁⲟⲟⲥ ⲛⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲛⲟⲩ
22 ⲛ̄ⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲟⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲕⲉ
23 ⲁⲉ [ⲧ]ⲛ̄ⲑⲱⲱⲁⲉ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲥⲓ
24 [ⲥⲛⲟⲩ] ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲟⲥ
25 [ⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ]ⲛ̄ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓⲁ
26 [. . . .]ⲉⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲕⲱⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲑⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧⲁ
27 [ⲥⲓⲥ ⲛⲛ]ⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲟⲩⲃⲁ̄ⲗⲉ ⲡⲉ
28 [ⲉⲧⲃⲉ] ⲡ[ⲉⲩ]ⲟⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ
29 [ⲙⲛ ⲧⲉⲩⲙⲛ]ⲧⲁⲁⲥⲓⲥⲏⲧ ⲁⲩⲁⲟⲟⲥ ⲥⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲩ
30 [. . . . ⲁⲉ] ⲁⲛⲟⲕ [ⲡⲉ ⲡ]ⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
31 [ⲁⲁⲛⲧ ⲛⲧⲁ]ⲣⲉⲩⲁⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲛⲟⲃⲉ ⲉⲥⲣⲁⲓ
32 [ⲉⲡⲧⲏⲣⲩ] ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲉⲉⲓⲱⲁⲁⲉ ⲡⲱⲥ ⲱⲁⲥ

20 Concerning the hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) of the Powers (ἐξουσία). In the Spirit (πνεῦμα)
21 of the Father of Truth, the great apostle (ἀπόστολος) said to us
22 concerning the Powers (ἐξουσία) of darkness:
23 [Our] fight is not against flesh (σάρξ) and
24 [blood,] but (ἀλλά) it is against the Powers (ἐξουσία) of the wor[ld] (κόσ[μος])
25 [and] the spirituals (πνευματικόν) of evil (πονηρία).
26 . . . . to me, since you (m.) ask about the hyposta[sis] (ὑπόστα-[σις])
27 [of the] Powers (ἐξουσία). But (δέ) their Great one is blind.
28 [Because of his] might and his ignorance
29 [and his] arrogance he said in his
30 . . . . "I am God; there is none
31 [beside me." When] he said this, he sinned against
32 [the All.] And this speech reached up to

1 РАІ ЄТМ̄ТАТТАКО ЄІС ОУСМН ΔЄ АСЄІ ⟨Є⟩
2 ВОΛ 2Ν̄ ТМ̄ТАТТАКО ЄСХѠ М̄МОС Х[Є]
3 КР̄ПΛАНАСΘЄ САМАНΛ ЄТЄ ПНОУТЄ П[Є]
4 Н̄ВВΛΛЄ АНЄЧМЄЄУЄ Р̄ВΛ̄ΛЄ АЧНОУХЄ
5 ЄВОΛ Н̄ТЄЧ6ОМ ЄТЄ ПОУА Н̄ТАЧХООЧ
6 АЧΔІѠКЄ М̄МОЧ ⳩АПІТ Н̄ АПХАОС МН̄
7 ПНОУН ТЄЧМААУ ЄВОΛ 2ІТ Н̄ ТПІСТІС
8 ТСОФІА АУѠ АСКАΘІСТА Н̄НЄЧ⳩НРЄ
9 ПОУА ПОУА КАТА ТЄЧ6ОМ КАТА ПТУПОС
10 Н̄АІѠН ЄТМ̄ПСА НТПЄ ХЄ ЄВОΛ 2Ν̄ НЄ
11 ΘНП АУ2Є АНЄТОУОН2 ЄВОΛ АТМ̄НТ
12 АТТЄКО 6Ѡ⳩Т АПІТ Н̄ АММЄРОС НМ̄
13 МООУ АПЄСІНЄ ОУѠН2 ЄВОΛ 2Ν̄ НМ̄
14 МООУ АУѠ АНЄ2ОУСІА М̄ПКАКЄ МЄРІТ̄С
15 М̄ПОУ⳩6Н̄6ОМ ΔЄ Н̄ТЄ2Є ПІНЄ ЄТМ̄МАУ
16 ПЄНТА2ОУѠН⟨2⟩ ЄВОΛ НАУ 2Ν̄ НМ̄МООУ
17 ЄТВЄ ТОУМН̄Т6ѠВ ХЄ М̄ΨУХІКОС НА⳩
18 ТЄ2Є М̄ПНЄУМАТІКОС АН ХЄ 2Н̄НА
19 ВОΛ НЄ М̄ПСА МПІТН Н̄ТОЧ ΔЄ ОУЄВОΛ
20 ПЄ М̄ПСА НТПЄ ЄТВЄ ПАЇ АТМ̄НТАТ
21 ТАКО 6Ѡ⳩Т ЄВОΛ ЄПІТ Н̄ АММЄРОС
22 ⳩ІНА 2М̄ ПОУѠ⳩ М̄ПЄІѠТ ЄСНА2А
23 ТР̄ ПТНРЧ МН̄ ПОУОЄІН АНАРХѠН ΧІ Н̄
24 ОУСУМВОУΛІОН ПЄХАУ ХЄ АМНЄІТ[Н̄]
25 Н̄ТН̄ТАМІО Н̄ОУРѠМЄ Н̄НОУХОУС Є̣
26 ВОΛ 2М̄ ПКА2 АУР̄ПΛАССЄ М̄ПС[Ѡ]М̣[А]
27 ЄУРМН̄КА2 ТНР⟨Ч⟩ ПЄ НІАРХѠН Δ̣[Є ПСѠ]
28 МА ПЄТЄУН̄ТАУЧ Н̄С2ІМЄ ОУТ̣[Є 2ОУТ]
29 ПЄ Н̄2О Н̄ΘНРІОН НЄ АУЧІ Н̄Н̣[ХОУС]
30 ЄВОΛ 2М̄ ПКА2 АУР̄ПΛАССЄ М̄П̣[ОУРѠ]
31 МЄ КАТА ПОУСѠМА АУѠ [КАТА ПІНЄ]
32 М̄ПНОУТЄ Н̄ТА2ОУѠН2 [ЄВОΛ НАУ]
33 2Н̄ НМ̄МООУ ПЄХАУ ХЄ А[МНЄІТН НТА]
34 РН̄Т̄Є2ОЧ 2М̄ПН̄Н̄ПΛАСМА̣ [.....]
35 ЄЧНАНАУ АПЄЧ⳩ВР̄Є[ІНЄ.....]

Imperishability. But (δέ) lo! A voice came forth from
Imperishability, saying,
"You are wrong (πλανᾶσθαι), Samael," which is, "the god
of the blind." His thoughts were blind. He sent forth
his might, which was the blasphemy that he had spoken.
He followed (διώκειν) it down to Chaos (Χάος) and
the Abyss, his mother by Pistis (πίστις)
Sophia (σοφία), and she installed (καθιστάναι) his children,
one by one, according to (κατά) his might, according to (κατά) the model (τύπος)
of Aeon (αἰών) which is above. For out of the hidden
have been found the revealed. Imperishability
looked down to the regions (μέρος) of the
waters. Her image appeared in the
waters, and the powers (ἐξουσία) of darkness fell in love with it.
But (δέ) they were not able to reach that image
which had appeared to them in the waters
because of their weakness, for the psychics (ψυχικός) will not be able
to reach the pneumatic (πνευματικός), because they
are from below, but (δέ) he is
from above. Because of this, Imperishability
looked down on the regions (μέρος),
in order (ἵνα), in the will of the Father, to unite
the All with the Light. The archons (ἄρχων) held a
council (συμβούλιον). They said, "Come,
let us make a man of dust (χοῦς) from
the earth." They formed (πλάσσειν) the body
so that it was completely an earthly being. The archons (ἄρχων) however (δέ), the [body (σῶμα)]
which they have is neither female [nor male.]
Their countenances are of animals (θηρίον). They took [dust (χοῦς)]
from the earth. They formed (πλάσσειν) [their man]
after (κατά) their body and [after (κατά) the image]
of God which appeared [to them]
in the waters. They said, ["Come, let us]
set it up in our creature (πλάσμα) . . . . . .
it will see its co-image . . . . . .

[N]ⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲙⲁⲍⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲩ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲙ̄ⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲉⲩⲣⲛⲟ
[ⲉⲓ ⲁ]ⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̄
[ⲧ]ⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲙ̄
ⲡⲉⲩⲍⲟ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲓⲕⲟⲥ
ⲍⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲛ̄ⲍⲁⲍ ⲛ̄ⲍⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲃⲛ̄ⲃⲟⲙ
ⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲟⲥⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲁⲩ
ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲕⲁⲣⲧⲉⲣⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲍⲁⲧⲏⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲩⲛⲁ
ⲃⲱⲣⲃ ⲁⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲍⲟⲩⲱⲛⲍ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲩⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲛ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲃⲟⲙ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱⲱ
ⲡⲉ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲩ ⲙ̄ⲙⲛ̄
ⲛ̄ⲥⲁ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲡⲓⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲓⲕⲟⲥ
ⲍⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲍ
ⲛ̄ⲁⲇⲁⲙⲁⲛⲧⲓⲛⲏ ⲁⲩⲉⲓ ⲉⲡⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱⲍ ⲛ̄
ⲍⲏⲧⲩ ⲁⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲯⲩⲭⲏ
[ⲉ]ⲥⲟⲛⲍ ⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲭⲉ
ⲁⲩⲍⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲩⲕⲉⲓⲙ ⲍⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲁⲩⲥⲙⲏ
ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ ⲧⲃⲟⲏⲑⲓⲁ
ⲛ̄ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲥⲱⲟⲩⲍ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ
ⲛ̄ⲛⲑⲏⲣⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲕⲁⲍ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲍⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ
ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉ ⲁⲩⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲍⲟⲩⲛ ⲱⲁ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ
ⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ
[ⲉ]ⲧⲣⲉⲩⲏ ⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲍⲛ̄ ⲛⲍⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ
ⲙ̄ⲛ̄ ⲛⲧⲃⲛⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲏⲉⲓ ⲛⲁⲇⲁⲙ
[ⲁⲩ]ⲕ[ⲁⲁ]ⲩ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲉⲓⲥⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲩⲣⲍⲱⲃ
[ⲙⲙⲟⲩ] ⲛ̄ⲩⲁⲣⲉⲍ ⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲍⲱⲛ
[ⲉⲧⲟⲟ]ⲧⲩ ⲉⲩⲭⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲱⲏ
[ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉ]ⲧⲍⲙ̄ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲇⲓⲥⲟⲥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ
[ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲇ]ⲉ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲱⲏⲛ ⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ· ⲡⲉⲧⲛⲁ
[ⲛⲟⲩⲩ] ⲙ̄[ⲛ̄] ⲡⲉⲑⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲟⲩⲇⲉ
[ⲙ̄ⲡⲣ̄ⲭⲱⲍ ⲉⲣ]ⲟⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲫⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ
[ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲍⲏⲧ]ⲩ ⲉⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩ ⲥⲉ
[.....]ⲁⲓ ⲥⲉⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲛ ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲛ
[.....]ⲁⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲉⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓ

[we] catch it in our creature (πλάσμα)," not [realizing (νοεῖν)]
the strength (δύναμις) of God in
their weakness. And he breathed into
his face, and man became psychic (ψυχικός)
upon the earth for many days. They were not able
to raise him again because of their weakness. They
persisted (προσκαρτερεῖν) like the whirlwinds, in order to
waylay that image, which appeared
to them in the waters. But (δέ) they did not know
what its might was. But (δέ) all these things happened
in the will of the Father of the All. After these things
the Spirit (πνεῦμα) saw the psychic (ψυχικός) man
on the earth, and the Spirit (πνεῦμα) came forth from
the adamantine (ἀδαμαντίνη) earth. It came down. It settled
within him. That man became a living soul (ψυχή).
It called his name Adam, for (γάρ)
he was found moving upon the earth. A voice
came forth from Imperishability for the help (βοήθεια)
of Adam. And the archons (ἄρχων) gathered together
all the animals (θηρίον) of the earth, and all the birds
of the sky. They brought them in to Adam
to see what Adam would call them,
and to have him give a name to each one of the birds
and all the animals. They took Adam;
[they] placed him in the garden (παράδεισος) to work
[it] and guard it. And the archons (ἄρχων) commanded
[him] saying, "From [every] tree
which is in Paradise (παράδεισος) you (m.) shall eat,
but (δέ) from the tree of the knowledge of good
and evil, do not eat, neither (οὐδέ)
[touch] it, because the day you (pl.) shall eat
[from] it, you (pl.) will surely die". They
. . . . . they do not know what
. . . . . him, but (ἀλλά) in the will of the Father

ⲱⲧ ⲛⲧⲁⲩϫⲉ ⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲉⲓϩⲉ ϫⲉⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲉϥ
ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲛⲧⲉⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲟ ⲧ̣ⲏ̣ⲣ̣[ⲟⲩ]
ⲛ̄ϩⲩⲗⲓⲕⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲱⲟϫⲛⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩ
ⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ϫⲉ ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲧⲛ̄ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲃⲱⲉ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲛ̄ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϩⲱⲣⲡ
ⲧⲃⲱⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲥⲟⲟⲩⲛ ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲥ̄ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥϩⲱⲣⲡ ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲉⲛ
ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲥⲡⲓⲣ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲛϩ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲕⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥⲥⲡⲓⲣ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁⲣⲝ
ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲙ̄ⲯⲩⲭⲓ
ⲕⲟⲥ ⲧⲏⲣϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲏ
ⲁⲥⲓ ⲱⲁⲣⲟϥ ⲁⲥⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲙ̄ⲙⲁϥ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲥ
ϫⲉ ⲧⲱⲟⲩⲛ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉϥⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
ⲡⲉϫⲁϥ ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁϩ† ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲙ̄ⲡⲱⲛϩ
ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲣⲟ ϫⲉ ⲧⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲧⲟⲛϩ
ϫⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲥ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲥⲟⲉⲓⲛ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉⲛⲧⲁϩⲙⲓⲥⲉ ⲁⲛⲉ
ϧⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲓ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲱⲁ ⲡⲟⲩⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ
ⲣⲟⲩⲛⲁⲩ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲧⲉⲩⲱⲃ̄ⲣ̄ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲉⲥⲱⲁϫⲉ ⲛⲙ̄
ⲙⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲱⲧⲟⲣⲧ̄ⲣ̄ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲱⲧⲟⲣⲧ̄ⲣ̄
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩⲙⲉⲣⲉⲓⲧ̄ⲥ̄ ⲡⲉϫⲁⲩ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ
ϫⲉ ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩϫⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲥⲡⲉⲣ
ⲙⲁ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉϫⲱⲥ ⲁⲩⲣ̄ⲇⲓⲱⲕⲉ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ
ⲁⲥⲥⲱⲃⲉ ⲛ̄ⲥⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧ
ⲑⲏⲧ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲟⲩⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲃⲁ̄ⲗⲗⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲥⲣ̄ⲟⲩⲱ[ⲏ]
ⲛ̄ⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲥⲕⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲥϩⲁⲓ̈ⲃⲉⲥ [ⲟⲩⲉⲓ]ⲛ[ⲉ]
ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϩⲁⲧⲟⲟⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩϫⲟϩⲙ[ⲟⲩ ϩ]ⲛ̄
ⲟⲩⲥⲱϥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲩϫⲱϩⲙ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲫⲣⲁ[ⲓ̈ⲥ] ⲛ̄
ⲧⲉⲥⲥⲙⲏ ⲱⲓⲛⲁ ⲉⲩⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲕⲁⲧⲁⲕⲣⲓⲛ[ⲉ ⲙ̄]
ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲩ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ ⲙ[ⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲩ]
ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ †ⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲓ[ⲕⲏ ϩⲙ̄]
ⲫⲁϥ ⲡⲣⲉϥⲧⲁⲙⲟ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁϥⲧ[ⲁⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥ]
ϫⲱ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁ[ϥϫⲱ ⲛϩ]
ⲧⲛ̄ ϫⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲱⲏⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ [ⲉⲧϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲡⲁⲣⲁ]
ⲇⲉⲓⲥⲟⲥ ⲉⲕⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲙ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ [ⲇⲉ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲱⲏⲛ]

they said this in this way, so that he
would eat, and Adam would consider them all
hylic (ὑλικός). The archons (ἄρχων) took counsel with each
other; they said, "Come, let us bring
a forgetfulness over Adam." And he slept.
But (δέ) the forgetfulness is the ignorance which they
brought over him. And he slept. They opened
his side like a living woman
and they built up his side with flesh (σάρξ)
in her place; and Adam became
wholly psychic (ψυχικός). And the pneumatic (πνευματική) woman
came to him; she spoke to him saying,
"Rise, Adam." And when he saw her
he said, "You (f.) are the one who gave me life.
You (f.) will be called the mother of the living,
because she is my mother. She is the physician (f.)
and the woman, and she who has given birth."
But (δέ) the powers (ἐξουσία) came to their Adam.
But (δέ) when they saw his co-image speaking with
him, they were greatly agitated
and they fell in love with her. They said to one another,
"Come, let us cast our seed (σπέρμα)
into her." They pursued (διώκειν) her and
she laughed at them because of their senselessness
and their blindness, and she spent a night
with them. She placed her shadow, [an image]
of her, under them. And they defiled [themselves]
abominably, and they defiled the seal (σφραγίς) of
her voice, so that (ἵνα) they might condemn (κατακρίνειν)
their very selves in their creature (πλάσμα) [and their]
image. But (δέ) the pneumatic (πνευματική) one (f.) came [in]
the serpent, the Instructor, and it [instructed them]
saying, "What did he [tell you (pl.)?]
From every tree [which is in the gar-]
den (παράδεισος) you (m.) shall eat, [but (δέ) of the tree]

[N̄]COYωN ΠЄΘOOY MN̄ ΠЄTNANOYϤ
[M̄]ΠP̄OYωM ΠЄXЄ TCϩIME N̄CAPKIKH XЄ
OY MONON ΠЄXAϤ XЄ MN̄ OYωM ALLA
M̄ΠP̄Xωϩ ЄPOϤ XЄ ϩM̄ ΠϩOOY ЄTЄTNAOY
ωM ЄBOL N̄ϩHTϤ ϩN̄N OYMOY TЄTNAMOY
AYω ΠЄXЄ ΦAϤ ΠPЄϤTAMO XЄ ϩN̄ OYMOY
ЄTЄTNAMOY AN N̄TAϤXЄ ΠAЄI ГAP NHTN̄
ЄϤP̄ΦΘONЄI MALLON ЄNЄTN̄BAL NAOY
ЄN N̄TЄTN̄ϣωΠЄ N̄ΘЄ N̄NINOYTЄ ЄTЄ
TN̄COOYN M̄ΠΠЄΘOOY MN̄ ΠЄTNANOYϤ
AYω TPЄϤTAMO AYϤITC̄ N̄TOOTϤ M̄ΦAϤ
AYω ACKω M̄MOϤ OYAAϤ ЄϤO N̄PMN̄KAϩ
AYω TCϩIME N̄CAPKIKH ACXI ЄBOL ϩM̄Pϣ H̄
ACOYωM AYω AC† M̄ΠЄCϩAÏ NM̄MAC AY
ω AMΨYXIKOC OYωM AYω ATOYKAKIA
OYЄN ЄBOL ϩN̄ TOYMN̄TATCOOYN AYω
AYЄIME XЄ NЄYKHK AϩHY AΠΠNЄYMA
TIKON AYϤI ϩN̄6ωBЄ N̄KN̄TЄ AYMOPOY
ЄXN̄ TOY†ΠЄ TOTЄ AϤЄI N̄6I ΠNO6 N̄AP
XωN AYω ΠЄXAϤ XЄ ADAM ЄKTωN NЄϤ
COOYN ГAP AN XЄ N̄TAOY ϣωΠЄ AYω ΠЄ
XЄ ADAM XЄ AЄICωTM̄ ATЄKCMH AЄIP̄
ϩOTЄ XЄ NЄЄIKHK AϩHY AYω AЄIKωΠ
ΠЄXЄ ΠARXωN XЄ ЄTBЄ OY AKKωΠ ЄI
ṂHṬI XЄ AKOYωM ЄBOL ϩM̄ Πϣ HN
N̄Ṭ [AЄ]IϩONϤ ЄTOOTK XЄ M̄ΠP̄OYωM Є
BO[Λ N̄]ϩHTϤ OYAATϤ AYω AKOYωM ΠЄ
[XЄ A]ΔAM XЄ TCϩIME N̄TAKTAAC NAЄI
[AC†] Ṇ̈AЄI AЄIOYωM AYω AΠAYΘADHC
[N̄ARX]ωN CϩOYOP TCϩIME ΠЄXЄ TCϩIME
[XЄ ΦOϤ] Ṗ̈ЄTARAΠATA M̄MOЄI AЄIOYωM
[.....]Ạ ΦOϤ AYCOYϩωP TЄϤϩAÏBЄC
[..... O]YATБOM ΠЄ ЄYCOOYN AN
[.....]ΠLACMA ΠЄ XIM ΦOOY ЄTM̄

of knowledge of evil and good,
do not eat?" The fleshly woman (σαρκική) said,
"Not only (οὐ μόνον) did he say there is to be no eating, but (ἀλλά)
'Do not touch it, because on the day you (pl.) eat
from it you (pl.) will surely die.'"
And the serpent, the Instructor, said,
"You (pl.) will not surely die. For (γάρ) he said this to you (pl.)
because he is jealous (φθονεῖν). Rather (μᾶλλον), your (pl.) eyes will be opened,
and you (pl.) will become like the gods, knowing
evil and good."
And the Instructor (f.) was taken away from the serpent
and she left it alone as an earthly being.
And the fleshly (σαρκική) woman took from the [tree.]
She ate, and gave to her husband with her, and
the psychic ones (ψυχικός) ate. And their evil (κακία)
arose from their ignorance, and
they recognized that they were naked of the spiritual (πνευματικόν).
They took fig leaves; they bound them
around their loins. Then (τότε) the Great Archon (ἄρχων) came
and said, "Adam, where are you," for (γάρ) he did
not know what had happened. And
Adam said, "I heard your voice. I was
afraid, because I was naked, and I hid."
The Archon (ἄρχων) said, "Why did you (m.) hide
unless (εἰ μήτι) you (m.) ate from the tree
that I commanded you (m.), 'Do not eat
of it alone,' and you (m.) have eaten."
Adam said, "The woman whom you gave me
[gave] to me. I ate." And the arrogant (αὐθάδης)
Archon (ἄρχων) cursed the woman. The woman said,
["It was the serpent] that deceived me. I ate."
. . . . . the serpent. They cursed his shadow
. . . . . he is powerless, since they do not know
. . . . . creation (πλάσμα). From that day on

MAY AΦOϤ ϣωΠЄ ϩA ΠCAϩOYЄ NЄϮOYC[IA]
ϣANTЄϤЄI N̄6I ΠTЄΛЄIOC N̄PωME Π[CA]
ϩOY ЄTM̄MAY AϤЄI ЄXN̄ ΦAϤ AYKOTOY A
ΠOYADAM AYϤITϤ AYNOXϤ ЄBOΛ ϩM ΠΠA·
PADЄICOC MN̄ TЄϤϩIME XЄ MN̄ ΛAAY N̄C
MOY N̄TOOTOY XЄ N̄TOOY ϩωOY CЄϣOOΠ
ϩA ΠCAϩOYЄ AYNOYX P̄PωME ΔЄ ЄϩPAϊ
AϩN̄NO6 M̄ΠΠЄPICΠACMOC MN̄ ϩN̄MKAϩ
N̄TЄ ΠBIOC ϣINA ЄNOYPωME NAϣωΠЄ
N̄BIωTIKOC N̄CЄTM̄PCXOΛAZЄ AP̄ΠPOC
KAPTЄPЄI ЄΠΠN̄A ЄTOYAAB MN̄N̄CA NAϊ
ΔЄ ACXΠO N̄KAϊN ΠOYϣHPЄ KAϊN ΔЄ
NЄϤP̄ϩωB ЄΠKAϩ ΠAΛIN AϤCOYωN TЄϤ
ϩIME ЄTI ACω ACXΠO N̄ABЄΛ ABЄΛ ΔЄ
NЄYϣωC ΠЄ M̄MANЄCOOY KAϊN ΔЄ AϤЄI
NЄ ЄϩOYN ϩN̄ N̄KAPΠOC N̄TЄϤCωϣЄ A
BЄΛ ΔЄ AϤЄINЄ ЄϩOYN N̄NOYΘYCIA ϩN̄
NЄϤϩIЄIB AΠNOYTЄ 6ωϣT ЄXN̄ N
ΔωPON N̄NABЄΛ M̄ΠЄϤXI ΔЄ N̄N̄Δω
PON N̄NKAϊN AYω KAϊN N̄CAPKIKOC AϤ
ΔIωKЄ N̄ABЄΛ ΠЄϤCON AYω ΠЄXЄ ΠN[OY]
TЄ N̄KAϊN XЄ ЄϤTωN ABЄΛ ΠЄKCON
AϤOYωϣB̄ ΠЄXAϤ XЄ MH ЄЄIϣOOΠ
M̄ΦYΛAẌ M̄ΠACON ΠЄXЄ ΠNOYTЄ N
KAϊN XЄ ЄIC TЄCMH M̄ΠЄCNOϤ M̄ΠЄK
CON ϤϣKAK ЄϩPAϊ ЄPOЄI AKP̄Ṇ . . . .
PωK ϤNAKOTϤ ЄPOK OYON NIṂ [ЄTNA]
MOYOYT N̄KAЄIN ϤNABωΛ ЄBO[Λ NCAϣϤ]
N̄XI KBA KNAϣωΠЄ ΔЄ ЄKЄϣЄ[ϩOM AY]
ω ЄKCTωT ϩIXN̄ ΠKAϩ ADAM ΔЄ [AϤCOYω]
N̄ TЄϤϣBP̄ЄINЄ ЄYϩA ACω ACXΠ[O N̄OYϣHPЄ]
N̄ADAM AYω ΠЄXAC XЄ AϊX[ΠO N̄OYKЄ]
PωME ϩM̄ ΠNOYTЄ ЄΠMA [N̄ABЄΛ ΠЄ]
ΠAΛIN ACω N̄6I ЄYϩA ACX[ΠO N̄OYϣЄЄPЄ]
AYω ΠЄXAC XЄ AϤXΠO N[AЄI N̄OYΠAP]

the serpent has been under the curse of the powers (ἐξουσία),
until the perfect (τέλειος) man should come.
That curse came over the serpent. They turned to
their Adam, they seized him, they cast him out of the
garden (παράδεισος) with his wife, because there is no
blessing for them, since they are under the curse as well.
But (δέ) they cast men
into great distractions (περισπασμός) and
pains in life (βίος), so that (ἵνα) their men should be
preoccupied with life (βιωτικός), and not have time (σχολάζειν) to at-
tend (προσκαρτερεῖν) on the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα). But (δέ) after these things
she bore their son Cain. But (δέ) Cain
worked the ground. Again (πάλιν) he knew his
wife; again she became pregnant; she bore Abel. But (δέ) Abel
was a herdsman, a shepherd. But (δέ) Cain brought in
fruits (καρπός) of his field.
But (δέ) Abel brought in a sacrifice (θυσία) of
his lambs. God looked upon
Abel's offerings (δῶρον), but (δέ) he did not accept
Cain's offerings (δῶρον). And the fleshly (σαρκικός) Cain
pursued (διώκειν) Abel his brother. And God said
to Cain, "Where is Abel your brother?"
He answered and said, "I am not (μή)
my brother's keeper (φύλαξ), am I?" God said to
Cain, "Lo, the voice of your brother's blood
cries up to me. You have . . . . .
. . . it will turn against you. Anyone [who should]
kill Cain will release [seven]
to take vengeance. But (δέ) you will gr[oan and]
tremble on the earth." But (δέ) Adam [knew]
his co-image Eve. She became pregnant; she bore (a son]
to Adam. And she said, "I have borne [another]
man from God in the place [of Abel."]
Again (πάλιν) Eve became pregnant; she bo[re a daughter]
and said, "He has begotten for [me a vir-]

[ⲑⲉ]ⲛⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲃⲟⲏⲑ[ⲉⲓⲁ] . . ⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲛ̄ⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ
[ⲛ̄ⲣ̄]ⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉ̄
ⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲭⲁϩⲙⲉⲥ ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲁⲛⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲣ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲉⲓ
ⲛ̄ⲛⲣ̄ⲁⲩⲍⲁⲛⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛ̄ⲥⲉⲁⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲱⲟ
ⲭⲛⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲣⲏⲩ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲙⲏⲉⲓⲧⲛ̄ ⲛ̄
ⲧⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲁⲧⲁⲕⲗⲩⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄
ⲃⲓⲭ ⲛ̄ⲧⲛ̄ⲭⲱⲧⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲥⲁⲣⲍ̄ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲭⲓⲛ ⲣⲱⲙⲉ
ⲱⲁ ⲧⲃⲛⲏ ⲡⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲛⲇⲩⲛⲁⲙⲓⲥ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ
ⲣⲉⲭⲉⲓⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲱⲟⲭⲛⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲭ ⲛ̄ⲛⲱϩⲉ ⲭⲉ
ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲛⲁⲕ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲕⲓⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲱⲉ
ⲉⲙⲁⲭⲣ̄ⲭⲟⲗⲉⲥ ⲛ̄ⲅϩⲱⲡ ⲛ̄ϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲥ̄ ⲛ̄
ⲧⲟⲕ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲕⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲃⲛⲟⲟⲩⲉ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛ̄
ϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲉ ⲭⲓⲛ ⲕⲟⲩⲉⲓ ⲱⲁ ⲛⲟⲃ ⲛ̄ⲅⲥⲉϩⲱⲥ
ⲉⲣⲁⲧⲥ̄ ϩⲓⲭⲙ̄ ⲡⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲥⲓⲣ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲛ̄ⲃⲓ ⲱⲣⲉⲁ
ⲱⲁⲣⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲉⲧⲉⲗⲟ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲉⲧⲕⲓⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲩⲕⲁⲁⲥ ⲁⲥⲛⲓⲩⲉ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉϩⲣⲉ ⲧⲕⲓ
ⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ ⲁⲥⲣⲟⲕϩⲥ̄ ⲡⲁⲗⲓⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲛ̄ⲧⲕⲓ
ⲃⲱⲧⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙⲁϩⲥⲉⲡ ⲥⲛⲁⲩ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲙⲧ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
ⲛ̄ⲃⲓ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲉⲩⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲁⲣ̄ⲁⲡⲁⲧⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉ
ⲭⲉ ⲡⲟⲩⲛⲟⲃ ⲉⲧⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲧⲉⲙⲁⲁⲩ
ⲉⲩϩⲁ ⲁⲥⲉⲓ ⲱⲁⲣⲟⲛ ⲁⲛⲱⲣⲉⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲕⲟⲧⲥ̄ ⲉⲣⲟ
ⲟⲩ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲥ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲱⲧⲛ̄ ⲛⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲙ̄
[ⲡ]ⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥϩⲟⲩⲟⲣⲧ ⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩ
[ⲱ]ⲛ ⲧⲁⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄ⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲧⲉⲧⲛ̄
[ⲱ]ⲃⲣ̄ⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁⲛ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲏ
[ⲩⲧⲛ̄ ⲁⲗ]ⲗⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲁ ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ
[ⲁⲡⲁⲩ]ⲑⲁⲇⲏⲥ ⲛ̄ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲕⲟⲧϥ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲉϥⲃⲟⲙ
[ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁ]ⲡⲉϥⲡⲣⲟⲥⲱⲡⲟⲛ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄
[ⲃⲁⲗⲁ]ϩⲧ ⲉϥⲕⲏⲙ ⲁϥⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲥ
[ⲡⲉⲭⲁ]ϥ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲭⲉ ϩⲁⲡⲥ ⲡⲉ ⲉⲧⲣⲉⲃⲱⲕ ⲛⲁⲛ
[ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ ⲛ̄]ⲧⲉⲕⲉⲙⲁⲁⲩ ⲉⲩϩⲁ ⲁⲩ† ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲙ̄
[. . . . .] ⲱⲣⲉⲁ ⲇⲉ ⲕⲟⲧϥ̄ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲃⲟⲙ ⲙ̄ⲡ
[ⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲁⲥⲱ]ⲕⲁⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲃ ⲛ̄ⲥⲙⲏ
[ⲛ̄ⲥ̄ⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲙ̄]ⲡⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ

gin ([παρθέ]νος) as a help (βοήθεια) . . . for generations (γενεά) of generations (γενεά)
of men. This is the virgin (παρθένος) whom no
power (δύναμις) has defiled. Then (τότε) men began (ἄρχειν)
to multiply (αὐξάνειν), and they became better. The archons (ἄρχων)
took counsel with one another. They said, "Come,
let us make a flood (κατακλυσμός) with our
hands, and annihilate all flesh (σάρξ), from man
to beast." But (δέ) the Ruler (ἄρχων) of the Forces (δύναμις), when
he had learned of their plan, said to Noah,
"Make yourself an ark (κιβωτός) from a wood
that does not rot, and hide in it,
you and your children, and the animals and the
birds of the sky, from the smallest to the largest, and set it
atop Mt. Seir." But (δέ) Orea came
to him, wishing to board the ark (κιβωτός),
and he did not let her. She blew against the
ark (κιβωτός); she burned it. Again (πάλιν) he made the
ark (κιβωτός), the second time.
The archons (ἄρχων) met her, and wanted to deceive (ἀπατᾶν) her.
The Great One among them said to her, "Your mother
Eve came to us." But (δέ) Norea turned to
them; she said to them, "You are the archons (ἄρχων) of
darkness. You are cursed, neither (οὔτε) have you known
my mother. But (ἀλλά) you have known your
co-image. For (γάρ) I am not from you,
[but (ἀλλά)] I came from above."
[The ar]rogant (αὐθάδης) archon (ἄρχων) turned in his might,
[and his] face (πρόσωπον) became like
a black [pot]. He ventured (τολμᾶν) to her.
[He said] to her, "It is necessary for you to serve us
[as] your mother Eve also did. For (γάρ) I was given
. . . . . Orea, however (δέ), turned in the power of her
[light. She] cried out in a great voice
[and said to] the Holy One, the God of the All,

1 ⲭⲉ ⲉⲣⲓⲃⲟⲏⲑⲉⲓ ⲛⲁ[ⲉⲓ] ⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲕⲉ
2 ⲁ ⲛ̄ⲅⲛⲁϩⲙⲉⲧ ⲁⲛⲟⲩⲃⲓⲝ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲡⲁⲅ
3 ⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲉⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲛⲙ̄ⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲏⲧ
4 ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲭ ⲛⲁⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲱⲱ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ
5 ⲉⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲉⲟⲩ ⲧⲉⲣ̄ⲧⲟⲗⲙⲁ ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ ⲉⲡ
6 ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ ⲡⲉⲭⲉ ⲛⲱⲣⲉⲁ ⲭⲉ ⲛⲧⲕ ⲛⲓⲙ
7 ⲛⲉⲁⲛⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲥⲉϩⲱⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
8 ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲭ ⲭⲉ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉ ⲉ̄ⲗⲉ̄ⲗⲏⲑ̄
9 ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲥⲁⲃⲉ ⲡⲛⲟⲃ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲧⲁϩⲉ
10 ⲣⲁⲧϥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲙⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ
11 ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲧⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲱⲁⲭⲉ ⲛⲙ̄ⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ
12 ⲛⲁϩⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲓⲝ ⲛ̄ⲛⲓⲁⲛⲟⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲛⲁⲧⲁ
13 ⲙⲟⲉ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲛⲉⲡⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ
14 ⲧⲛⲁⲱⲭⲱ ⲁⲛ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲃⲟⲙ ⲡⲉϥⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ
15 ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲃ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲧⲡ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲉϥϩⲃ̄ⲥⲱ ⲛ̄ⲑⲉ
16 ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲓⲱⲛ ⲧⲁⲧⲁⲡⲣⲟ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲛⲁⲱⲱⲟⲡϥ ⲁⲛ
17 ⲉⲧⲣⲁⲭⲱ ⲛ̄ⲧⲉϥⲃⲟⲙ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲓⲛⲉ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉϥϩⲟ
18 ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲭ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲛ̄ⲃⲓ ⲉⲗⲉ̄ⲗⲏⲑ̄ ⲡⲛⲟⲃ ⲛ̄ⲁⲅ
19 ⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲭ ⲧⲉ ⲧⲙⲛⲧⲣⲙⲛ̄ϩⲛⲧ
20 ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲟⲩⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲙ̄ ⲡⲉϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲫⲱⲥⲧⲏⲣ
21 ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲉⲧⲁϩⲉⲣⲁⲧⲟⲩ ⲙ̄ⲡⲙ̄ⲧⲟ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲡⲛⲟⲃ
22 ⲙ̄ⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛⲁϩⲟⲣⲁⲧⲟⲛ ⲉⲣⲉⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲭⲉ ⲟⲩ
23 ⲃⲟⲙ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲗⲁⲁⲩ
24 ⲛ̄ϩⲏⲧⲟⲩ ⲛⲁⲱⲃⲙ̄ⲃⲟⲙ ⲉϩⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲧⲛⲟⲩ
25 ⲛⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲉ ⲉⲧⲃⲏⲧⲥ̄ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲁϥⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ
26 ϩⲛ̄ ⲛ̄ϩⲁⲉⲉⲩ ⲛ̄ⲕⲁⲓⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲥⲉⲛⲁⲣ̄ⲣⲣⲟ ⲉ
27 ⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲉⲉⲓⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ
28 ⲛⲁⲱⲭⲁϩⲙⲉ ⲁⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲧⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ
29 ⲧⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲛϩ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲥⲱⲟⲟⲡ ϩⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧ[ⲁ]ⲧ
30 ⲧⲁⲕⲟ ⲡⲙⲁ ⲉⲧⲉ ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲙⲡⲁⲣⲑⲉⲛⲓⲕⲟⲛ
31 ⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲡⲉⲧϩⲓⲭⲛ̄ ⲛⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲁⲟⲥ
32 ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ϩ[ⲱ . . . . .]
33 ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙⲁⲧⲥⲉⲃⲉⲉⲓ ⲁⲧ[ⲃⲟⲙ ⲛ ⲛⲉ]
34 ⲉⲓⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲭⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲱⲱⲡⲉ [ⲛⲁⲱ ⲛϩⲉ]
35 ⲁⲩⲱ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ϩⲛ̄ ⲁⲱ ⲛ̄ϩⲩⲡⲟⲥⲧ[ⲁⲥⲓⲥ ⲁⲩⲱ]

"Help (βοηθεῖν) [me] against the archons (ἄρχων) of unrighteousness (ἀδικία)
and rescue me from their hands immediately." The angel (ἄγγελος)
came down from heaven.
He said to her, "Why do you cry up
to God? Why do you venture (τολμᾶν) up to the
Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα)?" Norea said, "Who are you?"
The archons (ἄρχων) of unrighteousness (ἀδικία) had removed themselves
from her. He said, "I am Eleleth,
Wisdom, the Great Angel (ἄγγελος) who stands
in the presence of the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα).
I have been sent to speak with you and
rescue you from the hands of these lawless (ἄνομος) ones, and I shall
now instruct you." But (δέ) that angel (ἄγγελος),
I shall not be able to tell of his might. His form was like
choice gold, and his dress was like
the snow (χιών). For (γάρ) my mouth will not be able to bear it
that I should tell of his might, and the form of his face.
Eleleth, the Great Angel (ἄγγελος), said to me,
"I am," he said, "Understanding.
I am from the four luminaries (φωστήρ)
which stand in the presence of the great
unseen (ἀόρατον) spirit (πνεῦμα). You think that
these archons (ἄρχων) have power over you. None
of them will be able to prevail over the root
of truth. For (γάρ) on its account he appeared
at the last time (καιρός), and they will rule
over these powers (ἐξουσία), and these powers (ἐξουσία)
will not be able to defile you and that generation (γενεά).
For (γάρ) your (pl.) abode (μονή) is in Imperishability,
the place where that virginal (παρθενικόν) spirit (πνεῦμα) is,
which is over the powers (ἐξουσία) of chaos (χάος)
and their world (κόσμος)." [But] I [said to him(?),]
"Lord, teach me about
[these] powers (ἐξουσία), [how] they came to be,
and from what hypost[asis] (ὑπόστ[ασις]), [and]

ЄВОЛ ϩN̄ АѠ N̄ϩҮЛН А̣[Ү]Ѡ NIM ПЄNТАЧТА
МІООҮ МN̄ ТОҮΔҮNАМІС АҮѠ ПЄХАЧ NАЄІ
N̄6І ПNО6 N̄АГГЄЛОС ЄЛЄЛНΘ ТМNТРМ̄
N̄ϩНТ ϩРАЇ ϩN̄ NАІѠN ЄМN̄ТАҮАРНХЧ
ЄСѠООП N̄6І ТМN̄ТАТТАКО ТСОФІА ТАЄІ
ЄТОҮМОҮТЄ ЄРОС ХЄ ТПІСТІС АСОҮѠѠ
ЄТЄNЄ ОҮϩѠВ ОҮААС АХN̄ ПЄСϩѠТР̄ АҮ
Ѡ ПЄСЄРГОN АЧѠѠПЄ N̄NІNЄ М̄ПЄ ОҮN̄
ОҮКАТАПЄТАСМА Ѡ ООП ОҮТЄ NА ПСА̄
ТПЄ МN̄ NАІѠN ЄТМ̄ПСА МПІТN̄ АҮѠ АҮ
ϩАЇВЄС Ѡ ѠПЄ ϩАПЄСНТ М̄ПКАТАПЄТАС
МА АҮѠ АΘАЄІВЄС ЄТМ̄МАҮ Ѡ ѠПЄ N̄ϩҮ
ЛН АҮѠ ΘАЄІВЄ ЄТМ̄МАҮ АҮNОХС̄ АҮСА
N̄ОҮМЄРОС АҮѠ ПЄСМ{ОҮ}ОҮГ АЧѠѠПЄ
N̄NОҮЄРГОN ϩN̄ ΘҮЛН N̄ΘЄ N̄NОҮϩОҮϩЄ
АЧХІ ТҮПОС ЄВОЛ ϩN̄ ΘАЄІВЄС АЧѠѠПЄ
N̄ОҮΘНРІОN N̄АҮΘАΔНС N̄NІNЄ М̄МОҮЄІ
ОҮϩОҮТСϩІМЄ ПЄ N̄ΘЄ N̄ТАϩІѠР̄ПN̄ХООС
ХЄ N̄ТАЧЄІ ЄВОЛ ϩN̄ ΘҮЛН АЧОҮЄN АNЄЧ
ВАЛ АЧNАҮ АҮNО6 N̄ϩҮЛН ЄМNТЄСАРНХЧ
АҮѠ АЧР̄ХАСІϩНТ ЄЧХѠ М̄МОС ХЄ АNОК
ПЄ ПNОҮТЄ АҮѠ МN̄ 6Є АХN̄Т N̄ТАРЄЧ
ХЄ ПАЄІ АЧР̄NОВЄ ЄϩРАЇ ЄПТНРЧ ОҮСМН
ΔЄ АСЄІ ЄВОЛ М̄ПСА NϩРЄ N̄ТАҮΘЄNТЄІА
ЄСХѠ М̄МОС ХЄ КР̄ПЛАNАСΘЄ САМА
НЛ ЄТЄ ПАЄІ ПЄ ПNОҮТЄ N̄ВВ̄ЛЛЄ АҮ
Ѡ ПЄХАЧ ХЄ ЄѠХЄ ОҮN̄ 6Є Ѡ ООП ϩІТА
ЄϩН МАРЄЧОҮѠNϩ ЄВОЛ NАЄІ АҮѠ N̄
ТЄҮNОҮ АТСОФІА СѠТ ЄВОЛ М̄ПЄСТН
НВЄ АСІNЄ ЄϩОҮN М̄ПОҮОЄІN ЄϩОҮN
ЄΘҮЛН АҮѠ АСПѠТ N̄СѠЧ Ѡ АПЄСНТ
АММЄРОС М̄ПХАОС АҮѠ АСР̄АNАХѠРЄІ
Є̣ϩ̣[РАІ ЄП̄Є]С̣ОҮОЄІN ПАЛІN АПКАКЄ
[.....] N̄ ΘҮЛН ПІАРХѠN ЄЧО N̄ϩООҮТ
[СϩІМЄ АЧТ]АМІО NАЧ N̄ОҮNО6 N̄АІѠN

from what material (ὕλη), and who it was that created
them and their forces (δύναμις)." And
the Great Angel (ἄγγελος) Eleleth, Understanding, said to me,
"Above, in the infinite aeons (αἰών),
is Imperishability. Sophia, she
who is called Pistis, wanted
to make a work by herself, without her partner. And
her work (ἔργον) became the images of heaven. There is
a curtain (καταπέτασμα) between those above
and the aeons (αἰών) which are beneath. And a
shadow came into being beneath the curtain (καταπέτασμα),
and that shadow became matter (ὕλη).
And that shadow was cast forth
successively (μέρος), and the form became
a work (ἔργον) in the matter (ὕλη) like an abortion.
It took shape (τύπος) from the shadow. It became
an arrogant (αὐθάδης) beast (θηρίον) in the form of a lion.
It was androgynous, as I have already said,
because it came out of matter (ὕλη). He opened his
eyes; he saw a great infinite material (ὕλη)
and he became arrogant and said, 'I
am God, and there is no other beside me.' When he said
this, he sinned against the All. But (δέ) a voice
came out of the height of Authority (αὐθεντία)
saying, 'You are wrong (πλανᾶσθαι), Samael,'
that is, the blind god. And
he said, 'If there is another before me,
well then, let him appear to me.' And
immediately Sophia stretched out her finger.
She put the Light into
the material (ὕλη) and followed after it down
into the regions (μέρος) of Chaos (χάος), and she turned back (ἀναχωρεῖν)
[up to her] light. Again (πάλιν) the darkness
..... matter (ὕλη). The archon (ἄρχων), being andro-
[gynous,] made himself a great aeon (αἰών),

ΟΥΜΕΓΕΘΟC ЄM[NTЄϤ]ΑΡΗΧϤ ΑϤΜЄ[ЄΥ]
Є ΔЄ ΑΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΑϤ ΝϩΝ̄ϢΗΡЄ ΑϤΤΑΜΙΟ
ΝΑϤ ΝCΑϢϤ ΝϢΗΡЄ ΝϩΟΥΤϹϩΙΜЄ ΜΝ̄
ΠΟΥЄΙѠΤ ΑΥѠ ΠЄΧΑϤ ΝΝЄϤϢΗΡЄ ΧЄ
ΑΝΟΚ ΠЄ ΠΝΟΥΤЄ ΜΠΤΗΡϤ ΑΥѠ ΖѠΗ
ΤϢЄЄΡЄ ΝΤΠΙCΤΙC ΤCΟΦΙΑ ΑCΑϢΚΑΚ Є
ΒΟΛ ΠЄΧΑC ΝΑϤ ΧЄ ΚΡ̄ΠΛΑΝΑ CΑΚΛΑ Є
ΤЄ ΠЄϤΟΥϩѠΜ ΠЄ ΪΑΛΤΑΒΑѠΘ ΑCΝΙ
ϤЄ ЄϩΟΥΝ ϩΜ̄ ΠЄϤϩΟ ΑΥѠ ΑΠЄCΝΙϤЄ ϢѠ
ΠЄ ΝΑC ΝΟΥΑΓΓЄΛΟC ЄϤΟ ΝΚѠϩΤ ΑΥѠ
ΑΠΑΓΓЄΛΟC ЄΤΜ̄ΜΑΥ ΜΟΥΡ ΝΙΑΛΔΑΒΑ
ѠΘ ΑϤΝΟΧϤ ЄΠΙΤΝ̄ ЄΠΤΑΡΤΑΡΟΝ ΜΠ
CΑ ΜΠΙΤΝ̄ ΜΠΝΟΥΝ ΠЄϤϢΗΡЄ ΔЄ CΑ
ΒΑѠΘ ΝΤΑΡЄϤΝΑΥ ΑΤΔΥΝΑΜΙC ΜΠΑΓ
ΓЄΛΟC ЄΤΜ̄ΜΑΥ ΑϤΜЄΤΑΝΟЄΙ ΑϤΡ̄ΚΑ
ΤΑΓЄΙΝѠCΚЄ ΜΠЄϤЄΙѠΤ ΜΝ̄ ΤЄϤΜΑΑΥ
ΘΥΛΗ ΑϤCΙΧΑΝЄ ЄΡΟC ΑϤΡ̄ϩΥΜΝЄΙ ΔЄ
ЄϩΡΑΪ ЄΤCΟΦΙΑ ΑΥѠ ΤЄCϢЄЄΡЄ ΝΖѠΗ
ΑΥѠ ΑΤCΟΦΙΑ ΜΝ̄ ΖѠΗ ΤΟΡΠϤ ЄϩΡΑΪ ΑΥ
ΚΑΘΙCΤΑ ΜΜΟϤ ЄΧΝ̄ ΤΜЄϩCΑϢϤЄ ΜΠЄ
ΠCΑ ΜΠΙΤΝ̄ ΜΠΚΑΤΑΠЄΤΑCΜΑ ΟΥΤЄ
ΠCΑ ΝΤΠЄ ΜΝ̄ ΠCΑ ΜΠΙΤΝ̄ ΑΥѠ ΑΥΜΟΥ
ΤЄ ЄΡΟϤ ΧЄ ΠΝΟΥΤЄ ΝΝΔΥΝΑΜΙC CΑ
ΒΑѠΘ ΧЄ ЄϤΜ̄ΠCΑ ΝΤΠЄ ΝΝΔΥΝΑΜΙC
ΜΠΧΑΟC ΧЄ ΑΤCΟΦΙΑ ΚΑΘΙCΤΑ ΜΜΟϤ
ϩΟΤΙ ΔЄ ΑΝΑЄΙ ϢѠΠЄ ΑϤΤΑΜΙΟ ΝΑϤ
ΝΟΥΝΟϬ ΝϩΑΡΜΑ ΝΧЄΡΟΥΒΙΝ ЄϤΟ Ν
ϤΤΟΟΥ ΜΠΡΟCѠΠΟΝ ΜΝ̄ ϩΝΑΓΓЄΛΟC
ЄΝΑϢѠΟΥ ЄΜΝ̄ΤΟΥ ΗΠЄ ЄΤΡΟΥΡ̄ϩΥ
ΠΗΡЄΤЄΙ ΑΥѠ ϩΜ̄ΨΑΛΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΜΝ̄ ϩΝ̄
ΚΙΘΑΡΑ ΑΥѠ ΑΤCΟΦΙΑ ϤΙ ΤЄCϢЄЄΡЄ Ν
ΖѠΗ ΑCΤΡЄCϩΜΟΟC ϩΙ ΟΥΝΑΜ ΜΜΟϤ
ЄΤΡЄCΤΑΜΟϤ ΑΝЄΤϢΟΟΠ [ϩΝ̄ Τ]ΜΑϩ
ϢΜΟΥΝЄ ΑΥѠ ΠΙΑΓΓЄΛΟ[C . . . . . .]
ΓΗ ΑCΚΑΑϤ ϩΙ ϩΒΟΥΡ ΜΜΟϤ [ΧΙΜ ΦΟ]
ΟΥ ЄΤΜ̄ΜΑΥ ΑΥΜΟΥΤЄ Α[ΟΥΝΑΜ ΜΜΟϤ]

an infinite magnitude (μέγεθος). But (δέ) he thou[ght]
to create for himself some offspring. He created
for himself seven offspring, androgynous, like
their father. And he said to his offspring,
'I am the God of the All.' And Zoe,
the daughter of Pistis Sophia, cried
out; she said to him, 'You are wrong (πλανᾶν), Saklas,'
the interpretation of which is Ialdabaoth. She
breathed into his face, and her breath became
for her a flaming angel (ἄγγελος). And
that angel (ἄγγελος) bound Ialdabaoth;
he cast him down to Tartaros (τάρταρον), at
the bottom of the Abyss. But (δέ) when his son
Sabaoth saw the strength (δύναμις) of
that angel (ἄγγελος), he repented (μετανοεῖν). He
condemned (καταγινώσκειν) his father, and his mother,
Matter (ὕλη). He loathed (σικχαίνειν) her. But (δέ) he sang praises (ὑμνεῖν)
to Sophia and her daughter Zoe.
And Sophia and Zoe snatched him up. They
installed (καθιστάναι) him over the seventh heaven,
beneath the curtain (καταπέτασμα) between
the Above and the Below. And they called
him the God of the Forces (δύναμις), Sabaoth,
for he is over the forces (δύναμις)
of Chaos (χάος), because Sophia installed (καθιστάναι) him.
But (δέ) because (ὅτι) these things happened, he created for himself
a great chariot (ἅρμα), Cherubin, which was
four-faced (πρόσωπον), along with angels (ἄγγελος),
many of them, having no number,
to serve (ὑπηρετεῖν), and some harps (ψαλτήριον), and
citharas (κιθάρα). And Sophia took her daughter
Zoe, and seated her at his right hand,
to teach him the things that are [in the og-]
doad. And the angel (ἄγγελος) . . . . . .
[. . she] placed on his left. [Since]
that [day his right hand] has been called

ⲭⲉ ⲍⲱⲏ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲧⲯⲃ[ⲟⲩ]ⲣ ⲁⲥⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲇⲓⲕⲓⲁ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲑⲉ̀ⲛⲧⲏⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛ
ⲧⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲯⲁⲧⲟⲩⲉⲯⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲣⲉⲓⲁⲗ
ⲇⲁⲃⲁⲱⲑ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ ⲉⲫⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲯⲙ̄ ⲡⲉⲓ
ⲛⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲉⲟⲟⲩ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲉⲉⲓⲭⲓⲥⲉ ⲁⲫⲕⲱⲯ ⲉⲣⲟⲕ
ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲕⲱⲯ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲛ̄ⲟⲩⲉⲣⲅⲟⲛ ⲉⲫⲟ ⲛⲯⲟ
ⲟⲩⲧⲥⲯⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲁⲉⲓ ⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲙ̄
ⲡⲕⲱⲯ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲁⲡⲕⲱⲯ ⲭⲡⲉ ⲡⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲡⲙⲟⲩ
ⲇⲉ ⲭⲡⲟ ⲛ̄ⲛⲉⲫⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲫⲕⲁⲑⲓⲥⲧⲁ ⲙ̄ⲡⲟⲩⲁ
ⲡⲟⲩⲁ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲭⲛ̄ ⲧⲉⲫⲡⲉ ⲁⲛⲡⲏⲩⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ
ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲁⲟⲥ ⲙⲟⲩⲯ ⲛ̄ⲛⲟⲩⲏⲡⲉ ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲱⲱⲡⲉ ⲯⲙ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲱⲱ ⲙ̄ⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙ̄ⲡⲧⲏⲣⲫ
ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲡⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁ ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲧⲏⲣⲟⲩ ⲱⲓ
ⲛⲁ ⲉⲫⲛⲁⲭⲱⲕ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛ̄ⲑⲓ ⲡⲁⲣⲓⲑⲙⲟⲥ ⲙ̄ⲡⲭⲁ
ⲟⲥ ⲉⲓⲥⲯⲏⲏⲧⲉ ⲁⲯⲓⲧⲥⲉⲃⲟ ⲁⲡⲧⲩⲡⲟⲥ ⲛ̄ⲛ
ⲁⲣⲭⲱⲛ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲑⲩⲗⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲩⲭⲡⲟⲫ ⲛ̄ⲯⲏⲧ̄ⲥ ⲙⲛ̄
ⲡⲟⲩⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲡⲟⲩⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲥ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲁ
ⲉⲓⲭⲟⲟⲥ ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲙⲏⲧⲓ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲯⲱ ☥
ⲏⲡ ⲁⲧⲟⲩⲯⲩⲗⲏ ⲛ̄ⲧⲟ ⲙⲛ̄ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲉⲣⲉⲏⲡ
ⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲭⲓⲛ ⲛⲱⲟⲣⲡ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁ
ⲛⲟⲩⲩⲩⲭⲏ ⲉⲓ ⟨ⲉ⟩ⲃⲟⲗ ⲯⲙ̄ ⲡⲥⲁ ⲛⲧⲡⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲯⲙ̄
ⲡⲟⲩⲟⲉⲓⲛ ⲛ̄ⲛⲁⲧⲧⲉⲕⲟ ⲇⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩⲧⲟ ⲛⲉⲍⲟⲩ
ⲥⲓⲁ ⲛⲁⲱⲧⲯⲛⲟ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲯⲟⲩⲛ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲧⲃⲉ
ⲡⲛⲁ̄ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲏⲯ ⲯⲣⲁⲓ̈ ⲛ̄ⲯⲏⲧⲟⲩ
ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲛ̄ⲧⲁⲯⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲧⲉⲓ̈ⲯⲟⲇⲟⲥ
ⲛⲁⲉⲓ ⲥⲉⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲛⲁⲑⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲥ ⲯⲛ̄ ⲧⲙⲏⲧⲉ
ⲛ̄ⲣⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲉⲱⲁⲩⲙⲟⲩ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲡⲉⲥⲡⲉⲣⲙⲁ
ⲉⲧⲙ̄ⲙⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛⲯ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲗ
ⲗⲁ ⲙⲛ̄ⲛⲥⲁ ⲱⲟⲙⲧⲉ ⲛ̄ⲅⲉⲛⲉⲁ ⲁⲫⲛⲁⲟⲩⲱⲛⲯ
ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲁⲫⲛⲟⲩⲭⲉ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲙ̄ⲙⲟⲟⲩ ⲛ̄ⲧⲙ̄ⲣⲣⲉ
ⲛ̄ⲧⲡⲗⲁⲛⲏ ⲛⲉⲍⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲁⲛⲟⲕ ⲇⲉ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲉⲓ
ⲭⲉ ⲡⲭⲟⲉⲓⲥ ⲱⲁ ⲟⲩⲏⲣ ⲛ̄ⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲥ ⲡⲉⲭⲁⲫ
ⲛⲁⲉⲓ [ⲭⲉ ⲯⲟⲧ]ⲁⲛ ⲉⲣⲱⲁⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲛ̄ⲁⲗⲏⲑⲓ
[ⲛⲟⲥ ⲟⲩⲱ]ⲛⲯ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲯⲛ̄ ⲟⲩⲡⲗⲁⲥⲙⲁ
[ⲡⲡⲛ̄ⲁ̄ ⲛⲧⲁ]ⲗⲏⲑⲉⲓⲁ ⲡⲉⲛⲧⲁⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲧⲛ̄

Zoe, and the left hand has become a type (τύπος)
of the unrighteousness (ἀδικία) of the arbitrariness (αὐθέντης) above,
which came into being before them. But (δέ) when
Ialdabaoth saw him in this
great glory and this exaltation, he envied him,
and the envy became a work (ἔργον) which was
androgynous, and this was the beginning (ἀρχή) of
envy. And envy begot death, but (δέ) death
begot its sons. It installed (καθιστάναι) each one
of them over its heaven. All the heavens
of Chaos (χάος) filled with their numbers. But (δέ) all these things
happened within the will of the Father of the All,
according to (κατά) the type (τύπος) of all those above, so
that (ἵνα) the number (ἀριθμός) of Chaos (χάος) might be completed.
Lo, I have taught you (f.) the type (τύπος) of the
archons (ἄρχων), and the material (ὕλη) in which it was begotten, and
their father, and their world (κόσμος)." But (δέ) I
said, "Lord, do (μήτι) I perhaps also
belong to their material (ὕλη)?" "You (f.) and your (f.) children belong
to the Father, who has been since the beginnings.
Your (f.) soul (ψυχή) came from the Above, from
the Imperishable Light. Because of this (διὰ τοῦτο), the powers (ἐξουσία)
will not be able to approach them, because of the
spirit (πνεῦμα) of truth (ἀλήθεια) which lives in them.
But (δέ) everyone who has come to know this way (ὁδός),
these are immortal (ἀθάνατος) in the midst
of men who die. But (ἀλλά) that Seed (σπέρμα)
will not be revealed now, but (ἀλλά)
after three generations (γενεά) he will appear.
He has rescued them from the bond
of the error (πλάνη) of the powers (ἐξουσία)." But (δέ) I said,
"Lord, how long a time (χρόνος)?" He said
to me, "When (ὅταν) the True (ἀληθινός) Man
[appears] in a creaturely form (πλάσμα).
[The Spirit (πνεῦμα) of] Truth (ἀλήθεια), whom the Father has

NOOYϤ [. . . .] ⲡⲉⲧⲙⲙAY NATAMOOY ϵ
ΤΒϵ ϩωΒ N[IM] AYω ϤNATAϩCOY ϩⲙ ⲡXPϵI
CMA ⲙⲡωNϩ ⲱA ϵNϵϩ ⲡAϵI ⲛTAYTA
AϤ NAϤ ϵBOΛ ϩⲛ TΓϵNϵA TϵTⲙⲙⲛTϵC
ⲢPO TOTϵ CϵNANOYXϵ ϵBOΛ ⲙMOOY
ⲙⲡMϵϵYϵ ⲂⲂⲗϵ AYω CϵNAⲢKATAⲡA
TϵI ⲙⲡMOY ⲛⲛϵϮOYCIA AYω CϵNABωK
ϵϩPAⲒ ϵⲡOYOϵIN ϵTϵ MⲛTAϤAPHXϤ
ⲡAϵI ϵTϵ ⲡϵϵICⲡϵPMA ⲱOOⲡ ⲙMAY
TOTϵ NϵϮOYCIA CϵNAKω ⲛCωOY ⲛNOY
KAIPOC AYω NOYAΓΓϵΛOC CϵNAPIMϵ
ϵXⲛ ⲡOYTAKO AYω NOYΔAIMωN CϵNA
ⲢϩHBϵ ϵXⲛ ⲡOYMOY TOTϵ ⲛⲱHPϵ TH
POY ⲙⲡOYOϵIN CϵNACOYωN TAΛHΘϵI
A Mⲛ TOYNOYNϵ ϩⲛ OYMϵ AYω ⲡϵIωT
ⲙⲡTHPϤ Mⲛ ⲡⲛⲀ ϵTOYAAB CϵNAXOOC
THPOY ϩⲛⲛ OYCMH OYωT Xϵ OYΔIKAI
OC Tϵ TAΛHΘϵIA ⲙⲡϵIωT AYω ⲡⲱHPϵ
ϩIXⲛ ⲡTHPϤ AYω ϵBOΛ ϩITⲛ OYON NIM
ⲱA NIϵNϵϩ ⲛϵNϵϩ ϩAΓIOC ϩAΓIOC ϩA
ΓIOC ϩAMHN: ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩ ⟩

ΤΘYⲡOCTACIC
ⲛⲛAPXωN:

sent . . . ., he will teach them
about everything, and will anoint them with the anointing (χρῖσμα)
of Eternal Life, which has been given him
from the kingless generation (γενεά).
Then (τότε) they will cast away from them
blind thought, and they will trample (καταπατεῖν)
the powers (ἐξουσία) to death, and they will go
up to the Infinite Light,
where this Seed (σπέρμα) is.
Then (τότε) the powers (ἐξουσία) will renounce their
times (καιρός), and the angels (ἄγγελος) will weep
over their destruction, and their demons (δαίμων) will
mourn over their death. Then (τότε) all the sons
of Light will indeed know the truth (ἀλήθεια),
and their root, and the Father
of the All, and the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα). They will
all say with a single voice, 'Righteous (δίκαιος)
is the truth (ἀλήθεια) of the Father, and the Son
is over the All, and through everyone,
forever and ever. Holy (ἅγιος), Holy (ἅγιος),
Holy (ἅγιος). Amen.'"

The Hypostasis (ὑπόστασις) of the Archons (ἄρχων)

COMMENTARY

134, 20—134, 25 Introduction

134, 20

The title of this document is found in the customary place, which is at the end of the writing: 145, 22—23. This first phrase should be considered an introduction to the subject matter of the treatise rather than as the title proper, which uses no introductory preposition. Contrary to the usual practice in Greek and Latin literature, where the titles of treatises are generally given with a preposition such as de or περί, none of the Nag-Hammadi titles given in the summary of Krause and Labib follow this usage[1]. The employment of the preposition ⲈⲦⲂⲈ here may then indicate the work of an editor.

In the translation offered, the word ὑπόστασις has simply been transliterated. It cannot be said with any certainty that the correct understanding of it is "nature," or "essence," as Schenke renders it in his translation, "Das Wesen der Archonten." The document itself offers no real explanation of the nature of the archons. They are material, they are hostile to man, but it is not likely that this alone is the justification for the title. The treatise does, however, go on to give an account of the origin of the archons, and it is in this sense that the title is most probably to be understood[2].

While ὑπόστασις does mean "nature" or "essence," "origin" is also a legitimate meaning. Heinrich Dörrie, in a recent and thorough study of the word from the classical writers, through the great philosophers, and into Christian theological usage, concludes that of the two meanings, "existence, essence," or "becoming, realization," the latter, which had been given philosophical standing by the Stoics, predominated for centuries in its use outside the main philosophical schools[3]. In some

---

[1] Krause and Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes, pp. 7—36. The positioning of the titles is discussed on pp. 28—29. Krause and Labib summarize only six of the thirteen codices, but the titles are there given in Coptic. For summaries of all the titles, see Puech, Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques, pp. 101—110, or the more concise listing of Doresse, Secret Books, pp. 142—145. The numbering of the codices differs in each of these sources. That of Krause and Labib, which is coming to be recognized as quasi-official, is used in this work.

[2] Cf. below, 142, 4—143, 4.

[3] Heinrich Dörrie, "Ὑπόστασις, Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte" NAG. Phil.-hist. Klasse, Jahrg. 1955, Nr. 3, p. 61.

writers, ὑπόστασις can be a virtual equivalent to γένεσις[4]. It was the use of the word in Christian theology that has prejudiced its use in favor of "nature" or "essence[5]."

The transliteration employed here is itself open to the misunderstanding of being taken in the later theological sense, but this course is followed to leave the translation fully as ambiguous and open to interpretation as the original[6]. Since in HA the archons have no individuality, except for their chief, they can hardly be thought of as hypostases after the order of Valentinian Gnosticism, or of trinitarian theology[7]. They are mythological figures, and their importance is largely cosmogonic. The interest of the document is in how these beings so antagonistic to man came into existence. In the treatise as it stands, however, this story does not begin until the revelation to Norea beginning at 141, 19, although 134, 27—135, 11 is a summary of that revelation.

It will be noticed that the closing title uses the word "archons," while this opening phrase has "powers[8]." This raises the question of whether these two terms are intended to designate the same beings. Alexander Böhlig has considered this problem as it relates to HA, but especially as it pertains to the untitled document which follows HA in Codex II, and to which HA is closely related[9].

According to Böhlig, a synonymous use might be concluded from the exchange of terms in the title and opening phrase, but one finds on

---

[4] Ibid., p. 63. Of those references cited by Dörrie, mention is made here of only one, Sextus Empiricus Adv. Math. 7, 93: ἦν δὲ ἀρχὴ τῆς τῶν ὅλων ὑποστάσεως ἀριθμός, "Number was the beginning of the origin of the All."

[5] Dörrie, op. cit., pp. 36—37, 61. Cf. Socrates Scholasticus, Hist. Ecc. 3, 7 for an interesting observation on the philosophical use of the term in his day, a use which he terms confusion with οὐσία. Dörrie, op. cit., p. 37, n. 7, compares the situation to the use of the term "existence" in contemporary philosophy. For an earlier study of the term ὑπόστασις in the philosophers, see R. E. Witt, ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ, Amicitiae Corolla, ed. H. G. Wood, London, 1933, pp. 319—343.

[6] The term "original" as used here refers to the Coptic manuscript, and is not intended to beg the question of a previous Greek composition.

[7] The Hypostasis of the Archons will be designated as HA.

[8] The word ἐξουσία is uniformly translated "power" here, but "power" may render δύναμις as well; see the concordance.

[9] A. Böhlig and P. Labib, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung No. 58, Berlin, 1962, pp. 26—30. This document was supplied a title by Schenke with his publication of a partial translation, "Vom Ursprung der Welt: eine titellose Abhandlung aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi," ThLZ 84, 1959, 243—256. Schenke's title is here adopted as a convenient abbreviation for the work: UW.

examination that the passages of HA which use the term "archon" do not overlap those using "power." This is roughly true. The word "archons" is used from 135, 23—137, 3 and 140, 4—141, 23, except for 144, 16 and the episode of the "Great Archon" in 138, 19—31. Böhlig also notes a special connection of passages using "power" with "seed," and with the idea of defilement, a phenomenon which he also discovers in the untitled document. An analysis of the latter writing leads him to posit two sources, which he terms A (ἄρχων) and E (ἐξουσία)[10]. An objection which can be brought against this method is that the two words are not used often enough to guarantee that the pieces from a single source coincide with the successive pericopes in the treatise. One must first assume that his subject analysis of the treatise is so clearly implied that one clue as to source in a section is sufficiently strong as to enable the critic to assign the entire section to that source. How valid Böhlig's analysis for UW is will not be discussed here, but it must be said that it is very difficult to apply the criterion to HA. For example, after the archons create Adam and place him in the garden (135, 23ff.), it is the powers who are jealous of Adam's meeting Eve (137, 18ff.). It is very hard to see where this long account of the Paradise story could be so clearly divided into sections as to allow the occurrence of a certain word in a section to assign that pericope to a different source from a proximate section which uses another word for apparently the same concept. If other criteria can be adduced, and the divisions of source material as determined by each criterion coincide, a strong case can be made. In this case, such another criterion is suggested in the association of the "power" passages with "seed" and "defilement". This is indeed the case in 137, 18—31, but in a very similar passage, 140, 19—141, 8, it is the archons that are spoken of.

As Böhlig points out, there is the same difficulty in the relation of "archon" and "power" in The Apocryphon of John. At times the "powers" seem to be subservient to "the archon[11]," but "archons" also occur in the plural[12], and at times seven "powers" appear, including "the archon" among them[13]. The problem is partly astrological, a question of whether these beings represent the seven planets or the

[10] Böhlig and Labib, op. cit., p. 29.

[11] E.g., AJ II 10 (58), 27—28; 27 (75), 5—6. Where references are made herein to AJ II, the page number is first given in the enumeration of Krause and Labib, who use the original pagination of the codex. The plate number in Labib's photographic edition is given in parentheses, since this enumeration is used by Søren Giversen in his edition, op. cit. Citations are made from Codex II wherever possible. For comparison with the other three manuscripts of AJ, one should consult the synopsis in Krause and Labib, op. cit., pp. 49—53.

[12] E.g., AJ II 20 (68), 26; 27 (75), 5—6.

[13] E.g., AJ II 12 (60), 11—12, III 23, 16—17.

twelve signs of the zodiac[14]. In writings where the seven are given specific names, as in UW[15], or AJ, in which the twelve are named[16], the problem is more acute than in HA. Here the twelve are never mentioned and in the account of the Demiurge's offspring in 142, 5—143, 4, the reference is evidently to the planetary spheres. Irenaeus confirms, in speaking of the Ophite group, that the "Holy Hebdomad" is the planets[17]. Giversen remarks, "In the astrology of late Classical Antiquity, the signs of the Zodiac ordinarily played a role inferior to that of the planets[18]."

Böhlig remarks that the evidence of compilation on this matter afforded by both HA and UW points to a late stage of mythology[19]. This is possible, but it could also be argued that earlier, terms were used synonymously which later came to be more severely systematized. This is certainly the case of Pistis Sophia. It would be especially likely if the confused terms were contributed to a common Gnostic vocabulary from differing linguistic traditions.

The term ἄρχων may be used with reference to the verb ἄρχειν in the LXX of Genesis 1, 16, 18[20]. With this should be compared II Enoch 30, 2—4, in which not only sun, moon, and stars are mentioned in the account of the fourth day of creation, but the planets are enumerated and named, using the Greek nomenclature involving the names of the classical deities[21]. In the light of AJ II 11 (59), 4—5, it may be that ἄρχων = PPO should be added to Till's list of Greek-Coptic equiv-

---

[14] In ancient astronomy, the seven planets included the sun and moon as well as the five visible planets.

[15] UW 149, 14—150, 2. Cf. Böhlig's comments on pp. 20—21, 44—45 of his edition.

[16] AJ II 10 (58), 28—11 (59), 4. Cf. also Giversen's discussion of "archon" and "power" in AJ, op. cit., pp. 203—206, 216—217.

[17] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 9 (ed. Harvey I, 236). Although Irenaeus does not specifically say so, it is generally agreed that in section 30 he is speaking of the Ophites.

[18] Giversen, op. cit., p. 205.

[19] Böhlig and Labib, op. cit., pp. 27—28.

[20] C. H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, London, 1935, p. 139. Dodd notes that for this expression Theodotion uses εἰς ἐξουσίαν, and Aquila ἐξουσιάζειν.

[21] R. H. Charles (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament 2 vols, Oxford, 1913, II, 448. It is indicated here that the pseudoplatonic treatise Epinomis is the first source to assign each planet to a god. On the place of Epinomis in this context, see Gilles Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition, ErJb 22 (1954), 209. See also W. Theiler, Gott und Seele im kaiserzeitlichen Denken, Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, No. 3, Verona, 1957, p. 66. Cf. also PS 235, 15—18. References to Pistis Sophia are made in the usual fashion by page and line numbers in the edition of Carl Schmidt and Walter C. Till, Koptisch-gnostische Schriften GCS 45, N. F. 13, 3. Aufl., Berlin, 1962.

alents in Gnostic terminology[22]. In Poimandres, διοικητής is the term used for the seven "governors" who encompass the sensible world in circles[23].

It can certainly be said of HA that an editor's hand can be detected in it, but it is very doubtful if the entire document can be successfully analyzed on the basis of the terms used for these super-human beings. To complicate the matter, the terms δύναμις and αἰων are also used, though the identity of these with the archons and powers is not clear. It is more likely that the two terms are quite synonymous, at least as the treatise left the hands of the editor[24].

A problem of punctuation is presented in this first line of the document, for it is possible to understand the phrase "in the Spirit of the Father of Truth" as belonging with the next thought, as read here, or as connected to the first, in either of two ways. It may be taken as a qualification of the "hypostasis" or of "the powers," as Doresse has done[25]. However, it could be argued that this "hypostasis" did not take place in the spirit of the Father of Truth, but rather, in opposition to him[26]. Again, the phrase may be understood as a quasi-liturgical introduction to the following material, after the order of the familiar Trinitarian formula, as Schenke punctuates it[27]. This solution is more satisfying than that of Doresse, but in the translation offered here, the phrase is understood as introducing a new thought, an inspired apostolic saying.

134, 21.

The phrase "Father of Truth" is found at the beginning of The Gospel of Truth[28] and in Epiphanius' account of a Valentinian work[29]. The meaning is perhaps "the true Father," i. e., the real, genuine Father, over against the Demiurge who begets his offspring in the course of this writing. However, one would prefer ⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲙⲙⲉ for this interpretation. With the article, then, it is more safely left in literal

[22] Walter C. Till (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60, Berlin, 1955, p. 13. Cf. also Giversen, op. cit., p. 216.

[23] Poimandres 9 is the first occurrence. See A. D. Nock and A. J. Festugière, Corpus Hermeticum (4 vols) Paris, 1960 I, 9, 20, n. 27.

[24] Cf. Epiphanius Panarion 37, 4, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 55, 10) where this synonymity of terms is noted among Egyptian Ophites.

[25] Doresse, op. cit., p. 159.

[26] It is said, however, that "these things happened within the will of the Father of the All;" cf. 144, 11—12.

[27] Schenke, in loco.

[28] EV 16, 33. K. Grobel, in his translation of EV, The Gospel of Truth: a Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel New York and Nashville, 1960, p. 33, comments on the similar grammatical construction of the phrase "Gospel of Truth" in the opening line of that document.

[29] Epiphanius Panarion 31, 5, 5 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 391, 6).

translation[30]. Cf. however AJ II 30 (78), 4, where the doomed are those who did not know "the God of truth," ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ΝΤΜΗΕ.

It is noteworthy that Paul is not mentioned by name in introducing the quotation, but is rather termed "the great apostle." Indeed, it is unusual to find a citation from the Pauline literature at all, for references to Paul are not common in Gnostic literature. Apart from The Apocalypse of Paul in Codex V, Paul is never named in the Nag-Hammadi texts, although there are allusions[31].

There is a further allusion to Ephesians at the close of HA 145, 17 to 19, and another at 139, 2, in an editorial gloss. Aside from such a gloss, there is indeed nothing specifically Christian in HA from the end of this introduction at 134, 25 to the beginning of the revelation to Norea at 141, 13. In this revelation, moreover, there is no unmistakable Christian influence until the closing section beginning at 144, 31. Only at the beginning and end of HA is Christian influence discernible. This fact, plus the observation that these sections are detachable from a literary point of view, lead to the conclusion that Christian Gnostic touches have been added to a writing or writings that were not originally touched by Christian thought. There is no way of telling if these Vorlagen may have been actually pre-Christian, historically speaking, but there is nothing to preclude it.

Such Christian insertions into Gnostic documents are noted in other writings. R. McL. Wilson, from a study of the New Testament references in The Gospel of Mary, concludes that two originally independent documents have been artificially combined by a Christian Gnostic editor and placed "into a framework consisting partly of New Testament citation and partly of his own free composition[32]." Wilson is careful, however, to point out that this does not solve any question of pre-Christian Gnostic documents. Doresse has remarked of The Apocryphon of John, "Il n'a de chrétien que son titre, son prologue et son épilogue[33]." Most recently, Alexander Böhlig believes

---

[30] Grobel, loc. cit.

[31] Doresse, op. cit., pp. 306—309, speculates on the reasons for this lack of reference to Paul, and examines some of the allusions to the apostle which he has noticed in the texts. For an examination of Pauline references in Gnosticism known before the Nag-Hammadi discovery, see Eva Aleith, Das Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche, BZNW 18, 1937, 39—49.

[32] R. McL. Wilson, The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary, NTS 3 (1957), 240. This conclusion is in agreement with Till's opinion of the document's literary structure, op. cit., p. 26.

[33] Jean Doresse, Nouveaux aperçus historiques sur les Gnostiques coptes: Ophites et Séthiens, Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte, 31 (1949), 413. For a literary analysis cf. Hans-Martin Schenke, Nag-Hamadi Studien I: das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis, ZRGG 14, (1962) 57—63.

that he can detect a pre-Christian writing in The Apocalypse of Adam[34].

134, 22.

Besides here, "powers of darkness" are found in 135, 14 and 141, 31. "Archons of darkness" appear in 140, 23 and in UW 169, 28. Both expressions, often with the further description, "outer darkness," are found throughout Pistis Sophia. The classic exposition of the dualism of light and darkness found in Gnosticism explains that light is the correlative of life, and darkness the correlative of death. Since life consists in a liberation of the light-principle within man, which is imprisoned by man's material nature, life and light become antitheses to this world, which in turn is symbolized by darkness and death[35].

That this was the understanding of the Christian Gnostic editor of HA is clearly demonstrated in that the apostle's word concerning "the powers of the world" is introduced by this phrase, "concerning the powers of darkness." A correlative expression of this interpretation is found in the epilogue to HA 144, 21—24, in which life and light are discussed. That an allegorization along this line dominates the mythological section from 135, 11 to 140, 32 is probable, but not certain. In the myth as set forth there, the concepts of light and darkness have a cosmogonic significance that is stronger than any eschatological or soteriological overtones. Darkness may indeed represent death, but this is a metaphor so natural to human experience that it can be found over all the world. As the concept relates to Egypt, see further on 135, 29.

134, 23—25

These lines are a loose but unmistakable quotation of Ephesians 6, 12, which reads in Horner's Sahidic version: ⲭⲉ ⲉⲣⲉ ⲡⲉⲛⲙⲓⲱⲉ ⲱⲟⲟⲡ ⲁⲛ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲥⲛⲟϥ ϩⲓ ⲥⲁⲣⲝ ⲁⲗⲗⲁ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲁⲣⲭⲏ ⲙⲛ ⲛⲉⲝⲟⲩⲥⲓⲁ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲕⲟⲥⲙⲟⲕⲣⲁⲧⲱⲣ ⲛⲧⲉ ⲡⲉⲓⲕⲁⲕⲉ ⲟⲩⲃⲉ ⲛⲉⲡⲛⲉⲩⲙⲁⲧⲓⲕⲟⲛ ⲛⲧⲡⲟⲛⲏⲣⲓⲁ ⲉⲧϩⲁ ⲙⲡⲏⲩⲉ[36], "Our fight (ⲙⲓⲱⲉ) is not against blood and flesh (σάρξ), but against the principalities (ἀρχή) and the powers (ἐξουσία), against the world rulers (κοσμοκράτωρ) of this darkness, against the spirituals (πνευματικόν) of the evil (πονηρία) which is in

---

[34] A. Böhlig and P. Labib (eds.), Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi, Sonderband der Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg, 1963, pp. 90—95.

[35] Succinctly expressed by Jonas, Gnostic Religion: the Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity, 2d ed. rev. Boston, 1963, pp. 57—58.

[36] G. Horner (ed.), The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect (7 vols.) Oxford, 1911—1924, V, in loco.

the heavens." Horner's Bohairic reading has ϯ for ⲫⲱⲭⲉ, and has the order "flesh and blood" as here[37]. The lacuna in the manuscript is supplied from Horner.

134, 26—135, 11 Summary

134, 26

This section presents a shorter statement of the material from 142, 4—144, 17, with some interesting differences. The first point of comparison is that both sections are given in answer to a question, the present one in response to a question either rhetorically presumed or editorially deleted, and the second to Norea's specific question regarding the hypostasis of the archons in 141, 33—142, 2. In the later passage the speaker is Eleleth; here it is not known. In the later passage the questioner is Norea; here he is unknown, but Norea is excluded, since the verb ⲉⲕⲱⲓⲛⲉ, "you ask," is compounded with the masculine prefix. This section, then, is either originally independent of the later passage, or was composed after it and worked into the same writing with it.

This line can be considered part of the introduction to the document as it now stands, but it seems best to consider it the beginning of a fragment from a writing very similar to that which has been incorporated into the treatise at a later point. Lines 20—25 do not sound like the introduction to a question and answer revelation discourse, but to a literary treatise.

134, 27

The "Great One" is the Demiurge, responsible for the creation of the other archons. The "Great One" also appears at 140, 20. He is the "Great Archon" in 138, 19 and UW 151, 16, and is the "First Archon" in AJ[38].

On the blindness of the Demiurge, see below, on 135, 3—4. This entire passage should be compared with its parallel in UW 151, 8—28, and its repetition in HA 142, 19—33 and 143, 4—13. Cf. also AJ II 13 (61), 5—9, and 11 (59), 15—22. Irenaeus also tells of the blasphemy of the Demiurge[39]. In each of these passages in Irenaeus the mother of the Demiurge is also involved. The "Great Archon" of Basilides, according to Hippolytus, imagines himself to be God, but there is no direct citation of the biblical passage, Isaiah 45,6[40].

[37] G. Horner (ed.), The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect (4 vols.) Oxford, 1898—1905, IV, in loco.

[38] E.g., AJ II 10 (58), 20. Cf. the concordance of Krause and Labib, op. cit., p. 282, or of Giversen, op. cit., p. 125.

[39] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 29, 4 (ed. Harvey I, 226) 1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 232).

[40] Hippolytus Ref. 7, 25, 3 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 203, 5 sq.). Cf. also Pseudo-Tertullian, Adv. Omn. Haer. 2, 3 (ed. Kroymann CC II, 1403, 20 sqq.).

134, 28—31

In Sophia Jesu Christi the whole world is wretched because of its pride, blindness, and ignorance[41]. In UW 161, 14—15, the blindness of the archons is laid to their ignorance.

The speech of the Demiurge is a quotation of Isaiah 45, 6. The lacuna is filled in from the parallel in HA 142, 22, but on the biblical text, see below on 135, 3—4. The quotation identifies the Demiurge with the God of the Old Testament[42]. Jealousy was considered a prime characteristic of the God worshipped by the Jews. In A J II 13 (61), 8—9 and Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 29, 4, the quotation from Isaiah 45, 6 is prefixed with a proclamation of God's jealousy from Exodus 20, 5. Further on the Demiurge as the God of the Old Testament, see below on 143, 8.

134, 31—32

The lacuna is supplied from the parallel in 142, 23. "The All," in The Gospel of Truth, is the creation of the perfect Father[43]. The meaning is ambiguous, since grammatically ⲡⲧⲏⲣϥ may render a personal οἱ πάντες or a neuter τὰ πάντα[44]. In The Epistle to Rheginus, "the All" is the total of the saved, the pneumatics[45]. This may well be the reference here, considering the close parallel with "the immortals" of UW 151, 14, mentioned above. Irenaeus speaks of the Gnostics' fondness for this phrase with illustrations from certain expressions of Paul[46].

For the orthodox Jew or Christian, the statement of Isaiah 45, 6, with reference to God, would be accepted as a prerequisite of true faith. God is always known, and known as the Creator. Here, however, in the Gnostic interpretation, it has become a sinful blasphemy, because it was spoken in ignorance of higher orders of being, and to the Gnostic, ignorance is the primal fault[47]. Van Unnik believes that in

[41] SJC 104, 2—6.

[42] Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 24, 2 (ed. Harvey I, 197 sq.); Hippolytus Ref. 7, 28, 5 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 209, 5 sqq.); Epiphanius Panarion 40, 5, 1 sq. (ed. Holl GCS 31, 85, 14 sqq.).

[43] EV 18, 33.

[44] Grobel, op. cit., p. 39.

[45] Epistle to Rheginus 47, 26, quoted by J. Zandee, op. cit., p. 44.

[46] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 3, 4 (ed. Harvey I, 28 sq.). Cf. also below, on 145, 18—19.

[47] Orbe op. cit., p. 410. Orbe is exploring Tatian's interpretation of Genesis 1, 3, according to which "Let there be light" was not a command but a prayer. The idea is referred to by Clement in his Ecl. Proph. 38, 1 (ed. Stählin GCS 17, 148, 17 sqq.), where he refutes Tatian, interestingly enough, by reference to Isaiah 45, 6. Cf. also Origen De Orat. 24, 5 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 356, 6 sqq.), where Tatian is quoted as describing the situation before God's word as ἐν σκότῳ ἦν ὁ θεός (Koetschau 356, 10).

this interpretation there is evidence of a pagan reaction to monotheism[48]. This may be true, but it is not a matter of a massive hostility to an encounter with Jewish monotheism, but of a standing conservative adherence to an old mythology. The Gnostics were after all seeking one ultimately real God beyond the Creator and his underlings. It may be further said that this episode, so widely known among the Gnostics, is the result of Jewish legend being worked into a previously existing myth. The account of the blasphemy of the Demiurge is probably not so much a creation of Gnostic exegesis as a result of a myth of the haughty Demiurge coming into contact with Jewish monotheism.

135, 1—2

The voice from Imperishability is evidently the voice of Sophia. In 142, 28—29, Sophia rebukes Samael for his presumption[49]. In The First Apocalypse of James from Codex V, Sophia is called "the imperishable gnosis[50]," and again, "the imperishable Sophia[51]." In Irenaeus' account of the Ophites it is Ialdabaoth's mother who rebukes him[52].

135, 3

"You are wrong" is used both here and in 142, 25 in the middle form, and at 143, 7 in the active. The two forms seem to be used quite interchangeably, although the middle is the more common. Cf. the middle forms of UW 145, 27. 151, 17 (the passage parallel to the phrase here). 165, 12. 166, 8. 171, 16, 23; EP 103, 24 and 121, 3. Active forms are found in UW 162, 1, and EP 104, 17 and 115, 38.

It will be noted that, with a few exceptions, Greek verbs in HA are preceded by P, in accordance with Akhmimic usage.

135, 3—4

It is rather uncertain here whether the correct translation of ⲁⲛⲉϥⲙⲉⲉⲩⲉ ⲡⲃⲗⲗⲉ is "His thoughts were blind," or "His thoughts blinded." For ⲡⲃⲗⲗⲉ, Crum gives examples of both[53]. The question may be put in terms of whether the phrase is intended to amplify 134, 27, "Their Great one is blind," or the interpretation of the name Sa-

[48] W. C. Van Unnik, Die jüdische Komponente in der Entstehung der Gnosis, VigChr. 15 (1961), 78—79.

[49] However, in 143, 7 it is Zoe, the daughter of Pistis Sophia, who rebukes him. There Samael is called Saklas.

[50] I Ap. Jac. 35, 5—7. This document is edited and translated in Böhlig and Labib, Apokalypsen etc., pp. 29—55.

[51] I Ap. Jac. 36, 8.

[52] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 232).

[53] W. E. Crum, A Coptic Dictionary, Oxford, 1939, p. 38a.

mael here, "the god of the blind." The translation offered here assumes that the phrase is intended to apply to Samael himself, rather than to his subjects[54]. It has of course been explicitly said in 134, 27 that Samael himself is blind. The parallel passage in UW 151, 18 offers as an explanation of the name Samael, ΠΝΟΥΤЄ ΒΒΛΛЄ, which as it stands, is best rendered, "the blind God."

The usual etymology given for the name is סמ-אל, "venom of God," in keeping with the function of Samael as the angel of death, which is prevalent in Jewish legend[55]. However, the derivation from סום, "blind," is not heretofore unknown. It appears in cabbalistic sources[56], and in Christian sources is found in The Acts of Andrew and Matthias 24, where Andrew asks the Devil, "Why are you called Amael? Is it not because you are blind, and do not see the saints?[57]" Also in Theodore bar-Konai's Book of Scholia, in a section of the Ophites, Samael is spoken of as blind[58]. Hans Jonas recognizes in the allegory of Esau in Hippolytus Ref. 5, 16, 10 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 112, 27 sqq.) a reference to blindness as characteristic of the Demiurge of the Peratae[59]. In Origen's information on the Ophites, the address which the soul must make on arriving at the "Barrier of Evil" begins, "Solitary King, bond of blindness (δεσμὸν ἀβλεψίας), unconscious oblivion (λήθην ἀπερίσκεπτον), I hail thee. . . .[60]" Blindness as a characteristic of the archons in general is seen in The Gospel of Philip, where the "evil powers . . . are blind because of the Holy Spirit[61]."

Yet it can be urged that "His thoughts blinded" gives an explanation for his subjects' being blind: ". . . the god of the blind." Blindness denotes a characteristic of human existence apart from true gnosis[62].

---

[54] Cf. Jonas, Gnostic Religion, p. 297, n. 2, and Böhlig and Labib, Schrift ohne Titel, p. 49.

[55] L. Blau, s. v. Samael, JewEnc X 665. Hans Bietenhard, Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum WUNT 2, Tübingen, 1951, 116.

[56] L. Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, trans. H. Szold (7 vols.) Philadelphia 1909—1938, V, 121.

[57] R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet (eds.), Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (2 vols. in 3: reprint of the edition of 1898) Hildesheim, 1959, II/1, 101. According to the apparatus, most MSS read Σαμαηλ; one reads Σατανηλ. The Αμαηλ of the text should be given the rough breathing, since it is clearly a case of the spiritus asper replacing S.

[58] This information is from Doresse, Secret Books etc., p. 175, n. 49.

[59] Jonas, Gnosis, p. 221, n. 1.

[60] Origen, Contra Celsum 6, 31 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 101, 1 sqq.). Quoted from Henry Chadwick, Origen, Contra Celsum, Cambridge, 1953, p. 347.

[61] EP 107, 18—20. Quoted from R. McL. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, New York and Evanston, 1962, p. 35.

[62] Cf. SJC 126, 1—3, and HA 145, 6, where the saved will cast away blind thought.

Samael's blind subjects would then be the ignorant, those who, like their creator, know nothing higher than he.

This does not necessarily give the document any anti-Jewish animus, however, in spite of Isaiah 46, 9 being quoted as a self-proclamation of the jealous and inferior God of the Old Testament[63]. Jews in some heterodox tradition, such as that handed down from the community at Elephantine, could even have had a hand in the formation of this tradition, and probably did. For a geographical locus for such Jewish heterodoxy, no better place than Egypt could be considered[64].

A Sahidic fragment containing Isaiah 46, 9 was published by Wessely. It reads at this point: ANOK ΠЄ ΠNOYTЄ. AYω MN KЄ NOYTЄ NBΛΛI[65]. This could very easily be misconstrued, either accidentally or purposely, to mean "There is no other blind God," NOYTЄ NBΛΛЄ, or perhaps, though less likely, "no other God of the blind[66]." Unless this word play is to be dismissed as simply a remarkable coincidence, Coptic-speaking circles must have had a part to play in the fashioning of this aspect of the tradition, and yet somewhere there had to have been some knowledge of Aramaic as well.

Samael was known in the pseudepigraphical literature, though not as the Demiurge, but as a demonic or Satanic name[67]. As such he is also found in the rabbinic literature[68]. The Gnostic strain in the tradition

---

[63] Van Unnik believes anti-Jewish tendencies come in where more specific functions of the Jewish God are taken over, such as the inspiration of the prophets or the direction of the patriarchs; op. cit., p. 78. Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 10 (ed. Harvey I, 236—237).

[64] Van Unnik gives consideration to Antioch, primarily on the evidence of Irenaeus and Revelation that Saturnilus and Nicolaus, respectively, were from there; op. cit., pp. 81—82. Ancient witnesses as well as modern scholars can be quoted with reference to the origin of Gnosticism among heretical Jews. Cf. Eusebius Hist. Ecc. 4, 22, 5 (ed. Schwartz, GCS 9, 1. 370, 13 sqq.), in which Hegesippus finds the beginnings of the Gnostic sects in heterodox Judaism, and The Treatise on the Three Natures 12, from the Nag-Hammadi find itself, which speaks of the many heresies among the Jews, in which they posit more than one God. This latter source is discussed by G. Quispel, Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie, EvTh 14 (1954), 475. For an older view which drew far-reaching conclusions from the meager evidence available at the time, see M. Friedländer, Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus, Göttingen, 1898.

[65] C. Wessely, Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, 15, 4, Leipzig, 1914, MS no. 220.

[66] Cf. Crum, op. cit., p. 35a on NBΛ-.

[67] E.g., III Baruch 4, 8; 9, 7; Ascension of Isaiah 1, 8. 11; 2, 1; 3, 13; III Enoch 14, 2, and III Enoch 26, 12, in which he represents the Roman Emperor. Cf. Bietenhard, op. cit., p. 113, and Odeberg, 3 Enoch, Cambridge, 1928, pp. 37, 93.

[68] References are too numerous to merit single mention here. See Ginzberg, op. cit., 7, 414—415, and Blau, loc. cit.

is to be found in Samael's role as the creator God of the Old Testament, and in the association with Isaiah 46, 9. The use in Gnostic circles of this verse as a proclamation of the Demiurge has long been known from the Church Fathers[69], but only with HA and UW is the connection made with Samael. Taking the word-play seriously, the association was probably made in Egypt. Either the idea of Samael as the Demiurge, or the relation of the Demiurge to Isaiah 46, 9 must have been familiar before this connection was made. The latter is probably the case, since Samael seems to have been known even in Gnostic circles as a demonic figure other than the Demiurge[70].

135, 6—7

In 143, 10—13, the Demiurge is punished for his blasphemy by being cast into "Tartaros, at the bottom of the Abyss." In ancient Egyptian texts *nwn* (NOYN) is both the primeval ocean and the realm of the dead. In the Coptic Christian apocalypses, the term is used for the underworld, of which the most awful region is Tartaros[71]. Chaos is one of the terms for the underworld in Pistis Sophia, along with Amente and Outer Darkness[72]. Here, however, the meaning is cosmogonic rather than eschatological, the reference being to the primeval waters of Chaos rather than to Hell. The Tartaros passage presents a special problem.

The Abyss is mother of the Demiurge in UW 151, 24, in the same context as here. The meaning is that the Abyss, or Chaos, is his ultimate generatrix, for he is the immediate offspring of Pistis Sophia. That Chaos is his mother is a confirmation of a long suspected etymology of his name, Ialdabaoth, which first appears in this document at 143, 8. This etymology has sought to derive the name from ילדא בהות, "son of Chaos." This passage, and especially UW 148, 12—14, confirms that, even if the etymology is not ultimately correct, it is one that the Gnostics saw as well as modern scholars[73].

In UW 152, 10—11, Ialdabaoth's own offspring Sabaoth is described as rejecting his mother, the Abyss, the parallel to which is HA 143, 16—17. This is another instance of a more remote "ancestor" being called "mother."

---

[69] See above, note on 134, 27.

[70] Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 9 (ed. Harvey I, 236). A problem suggested here involves how close Irenaeus was to his sources, and how well he understood them.

[71] J. Zandee, Death as an Enemy according to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions, Studies in the History of Religions, 5, Leiden, 1960, pp. 314—315.

[72] E.g., PS 210, 1—12. Cf. Zandee, Death as an Enemy, p. 315.

[73] Giversen, op. cit., pp. 199—201, discusses the various opinions, but does not seem to be aware of these two decisive passages, and comes himself to a different conclusion.

After the punishment of the Demiurge, Pistis Sophia sets his creation in order by the installation of the newly formed aeons (chief of whom is Sabaoth) in the Demiurge's inferior world, after the order of the aeons in the real world above Sophia[74]. The word τύπος can be used to designate the model from which a lower likeness is fashioned (Urbild)[75], or the image itself (Abbild)[76].

In HA, the name "Pistis Sophia" is spelled with the definite article before both parts of the name, unlike the book of Pistis Sophia, where the name appears without the article before COΦIA. This would appear to indicate an early stage in the Pistis Sophia tradition. In HA 142, 5—6 and UW 146, 13, it is explained that both names refer to the same personage. See also the note on 142, 5—6.

135, 10—11

This phrase is evidently a proverb handed down in the Gnostic tradition, and as such has been translated here "have been found" rather than "were found," to give the idea of proverbial wisdom rather than reference to some particular event. Exactly what it was that was revealed out of the hidden is differently explained. In UW 171, 28—31, it is Faith that has been revealed[77]. In The Gospel of Philip, "the Nazarene is the one that is revealed in that which is hidden[78]." In the Coptic Apocalypse of Paul, the saying is found, worded as a promise made to the apostle[79]. A similar expression is found in I Enoch 46, 3, in which the son of Man "revealeth all the treasures of that which is hidden[80]."

135, 11—135, 23 The Reflection of Imperishability

This section appears to begin a new literary division, the contents of which describe the primeval history of humanity rather than extra-temporal events among the aeons and archons. In the preceding section as well as in the later section which it seeks to summarize, the Demiurge is not depicted as the Creator of man, and his history seems to allow no room for it. He himself arises, he creates his own offspring, utters his blasphemy, and is cast into the underworld.

In the present section, the Demiurge is man's creator and opponent. The logical place to insert this phase of his career into the wider nar-

[74] Cf. R. McL. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, London, 1958, pp. 203, 242—243, n. 172.

[75] Cf. HA 144, 13, UW 150, 3. 172, 20, and CMAT in AJ II 13 (61), 1.

[76] Cf. HA 144, 1, AJ II 14 (62), 34, and CMOT in UW 165, 14.

[77] Or perhaps Pistis (Sophia) is meant. In UW she is often called simply "Pistis."

[78] EP 104, 12—13. Quoted from Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 32.

[79] Apoc. Pl. 19, 13—14.

[80] Charles, op. cit., II, 214.

rative would be at the point of his blasphemy[81]. Man was among his creatures, and his attempt to be god as well as fabricator was part of that blasphemy. However, if the editor of HA had any intention of making such a harmony, it is difficult to understand his reconstruction, for the section here describing the creation of man and the beginnings of human history appears after the fall of the Demiurge. The editor may have understood Chaos and the Abyss to be the present domain of the Demiurge, but this does not seem to be the view of the later revelation to Norea, in which Ialdabaoth is cast into Tartaros for his impiety. It appears more likely that the present section introduces a new block of literary material of a different origin than either the preceding section or the later revelation. This block extends perhaps as far as the shift into the first person at 141, 13, and is distinct from other material in HA in that its content is worked around the primeval history of Genesis.

The question hovering over all of this material is whether the mythology surrounding and permeating the biblical story in these sections is a conscious creation of a gnostic interpretation of the account, or whether the biblical story is being accommodated to an already existent mythology. The latter is more probable. The mythological ideas have histories of their own, although different scholars offer widely variant reconstructions. Biblical material has been taken up and given a grossly heterodox interpretation in the light of a familiar idea or myth. HA clearly shows the first stages of the adaptation of Genesis material into an alien religious tradition. At times its course follows the biblical narrative almost verbally, and in the case of the Cain and Abel story of 139, 11—40, mythological accretions which later enveloped it are absent. The attitude to Genesis here is very much like that of The Apocryphon of John: "Not as Moses said . . .[82]."

135, 11—14

The reinterpretation of Genesis begins at this point, with Sophia looking down on the watery regions. Upon comparison with Genesis 1, 2, "the Spirit of God was moving over the face of the waters," another identification of Sophia is suggested. She is Barbelo, the virginal Spirit. It has long been noted that the use of the feminine word רוח in Hebrew contributed to the figure of a feminine Spirit in Gnosticism[83]. Irenaeus' Barbelognostics equated the Holy Spirit with

---

[81] In Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 232) man is made immediately after the blasphemy.

[82] For an illuminating study of the use of Genesis in AJ, see Søren Giversen, The Apocryphon of John and Genesis, StTh 17 (1963), 60—76.

[83] Cf. Acts of Thomas 27, EP 103, 23—26.

Sophia[84]. Bousset derived the name Barbelo from παρθένος on palaeographic considerations, which still have merit[85]. In HA 141, 29—30, Imperishability is described as the dwelling-place of the virginal Spirit[86]. In UW 148, 22, it is the image of Pistis Sophia which Ialdabaoth sees in the waters.

The motif of lower powers falling in love with the reflection of the image of a higher power is widely spread. In some systems, the image is masculine, as in Poimandres[87]. Where the image is feminine, the motif is sometimes mingled with a myth in which the lower powers attempt to rape the virgin. This is the case in a narrative said by Basilides to be of barbarian origin, which is recounted in the Acta Archelai. Here the image of the Light-Virgin is reflected and seen by the Shadows, who lust after her[88]. In HA, this particular motif is seen more strongly in the episodes of the assaults on Eve, 137, 18—137, 31, and on Norea, 140, 19—140, 32.

In AJ, Barbelo appears, but only in close connection with the Virginal Spirit and with the Ennoia of God. The three are not identical[89]. Quispel questions whether this three-fold scheme — Virginal Spirit, Barbelo, Ennoia of God — is original. He prefers to think that this complicated form developed out of simpler and earlier forms of the myth, in which one figure alone appears[90]. It is such an earlier, less systematized and sophisticated form which is presented in this section of HA[91].

---

[84] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 29, 4 (ed. Harvey I, 225).

[85] Wilhelm Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, FRLANT 10, Göttingen, 1907, p. 10. Bousset's derivation seems never to have gained wide acceptance, but it has a great deal to commend it. Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 165—166, examines several contending theories for the proper derivation of the name, but Bousset's is not among them. A suggestion of F. C. Burkitt's is given, but an earlier idea of his is overlooked, that the name may be possibly a corruption of the first two words of the Hebrew Bible. For this, see F. C. Burkitt, Pistis Sophia, JThS 23 (1922), 280. See also R. Eisler, Pistis Sophia und Barbelo, Angelos 3 (1930), 93—110.

[86] The name Barbelo is found neither in HA nor UW.

[87] Poimandres 14. On the different forms taken by this reflection motif, see J. Jervell, Imago Dei: Gen 1, 26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen, FRLANT N. F. 33, Göttingen, 1960, pp. 136—138.

[88] Acta Archelai 67.

[89] AJ BG 26—27. The Nag-Hammadi codices are in poor shape at this point, though all can be reconstructed in some manner. On the problem, see Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 165—168.

[90] Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos, pp. 197—199. On the sophistication of AJ, Till comments that it is the only Coptic Gnostic work known with its roots in philosophy; The Gnostic Apocryphon of John, JEH 3 (1952), 15.

[91] Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos, p. 213 makes the interesting and important observation that the idea of Sophia's shadow being projected into matter appears only in documents that are very old, or which show little or no Christian influence.

The reference made by this passage to the opening of Genesis has already been noticed[92]. In the picture of the primeval waters giving back a reflection, it is not utterly impossible that there is some indication of ultimate geographical origins. Maspero noticed that among the sea-going Phoenicians, Chaos was conceived as stormy, unlike the calm, silent, serene waters of Chaos known to peoples who had no intimate contact with the Mediterranean[93]. An inland people, then, may have originally contributed the myth of the reflection in the waters.

135, 15—16

The inability of the powers to grasp the image in the waters is related in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 24, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 196) and Hippolytus Ref. 7, 28, 2 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 208, 14 sq.).

135, 17—19

For the well-known three orders of human existence posited by the Gnostics, the transliterated forms "psychic," "pneumatic" and "hylic" are used in this translation, though "spiritual" may occur when the reference is to an individual. Regarding the reason here for the powers' not being able to attain to the pneumatic, cf. Irenaeus' account of the Valentinian school, in which it is stated that nothing psychic can enter the Pleroma[94].

135, 20—23

The All may here be the creation, or again, the reference may be to those men who are destined to be pneumatic. In any case, nothing has been said about the formation of the All. This may be the writer's interpretation of Genesis 1, 3. The idea seems midway between biblical idea of the creation of light along with all other things by God, and the cosmogony of Poimandres, in which Light is the original stuff, darkness manifesting itself only within creation. In this passage, the Light is eternal, as in Poimandres, but creation has need to receive it from another, as in Genesis.

The phrase "in the will of the Father" is probably a gloss; on this see below on 136, 10—11.

A special problem is presented at HA 135, 32, in which the image in the water is said to be God's. This can be laid to either the closeness with which the biblical narrative is being followed, or to editorial alteration. The mention of God in 136, 1—3 sounds very much like an editorial gloss.

[92] Cf. Sirach 24, 5—6, in which Wisdom walks in the depths of the Abyss.

[93] From his Histoire ancienne des peuples classiques de l'Orient, as quoted by Carl Clemen, Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos MV(Ä)G 43, 3, Leipzig, 1939, p. 35.

[94] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 7, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 59).

135, 23—26

The idea that other powers than God were associated with the creation of man was widespread not only among Gnostic groups, but even within Judaism. The root of the concept is surely to be found in Genesis 1, 26, where God speaks in the first person plural, "Let us make man . . ." In orthodox Judaism the legend takes the form in which God creates the man, but over the opposition of the angels[95]. In Philo, a view is expressed in which the angels actually share the creative task; this represents an attempt to explain the imperfection of man[96]. There are evidences, however, that in a more heterodox Judaism, the angels actually made Adam's body[97].

In opposition to Ginzberg, who argues that the theme of angelic hostility to man in Jewish sources was conceived and advanced in opposition to the more radical view that the angels or other powers actually formed man[98], A. Altmann believes that the legend grew out of a Gnostic background[99]. Quispel seeks to define the boundary of Gnosticism in this motif by saying that the idea becomes Gnostic when the powers create man in opposition to a higher power, be it God or Sophia[100]. What is found in Gnosticism, then, becomes an idea of Jewish heterodoxy, reinterpreted astrologically[101]. The body of man is fashioned by the seven planets, and hence his fate is controlled by them.

In this passage in HA, it is the archons who determine to make a man, after the image that appeared to them in the water[102]. This is likewise the case in UW 160, 32—161, 2 and AJ II 15 (63), 1—4. It may be assumed that the Demiurge is represented among the archons, and takes part in the plan to capture the fleeting image. In Epiphanius Panarion 37, 4, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 55, 11 sq.) however, the archons fashion man after the image of Ialdabaoth, and in Irenaeus Adv. Haer.

---

[95] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 8, 3—9. Ginzberg, op. cit., V. 69—71, nn. 12—13, cites a multitude of rabbinic sources.

[96] Philo De Conf. Ling. 179 (ed. Cohn-Wendland II, 263, 20 sqq.), De Opif. Mundi 74. 75 (ed. Cohn-Wendland I, 25, 8 sqq.), De Fuga 71. 72 (ed. Cohn-Wendland III 124, 32—125, 8).

[97] Justin, Dial. 62, 3 (ed. Goodspeed 168).

[98] Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 69.

[99] A. Altmann, The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legend, JQR, 35 (1944—45), 371—391.

[100] Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos, p. 204.

[101] Ibid. p. 205.

[102] Nor does one of the powers stand out from the others, as in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 24, 1. 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 196. 232), and elsewhere.

1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 267) Ialdabaoth, speaking to the other six powers, is suggesting that they make man after their own image. So also is the case in Hippolytus Ref. 7, 28, 2 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 208, 15 sqq.) regarding the doctrines of Saturnilus[103].

The fashioning of man from dust, as also in UW 160, 34, is more biblical than the Valentinian idea that man's body was formed from an invisible substance of fluid, fusible matter[104].

135, 27—28

The theme of bisexuality is involved in HA in two different ways. Here it is the bisexuality of the archons which comes under discussion, but later it is the androgyny of the first man. The connection in this document is made in that man is bisexual since he is made in the image of these archons. It is easier to gather material relative to the bisexual nature of the first man than for that of the archontic powers. Irenaeus tells that Sophia was thought of as double-sexed[105]. Here, and in UW 149, 24—25; 150, 2—4, the seven powers are androgynous as well. Bertholet concluded that androgynous deities were traceable to two types: primal beings of the mythologies of culturally deprived peoples, and the very wide-spread concept of the moon as bisexual[106]. The latter concept is very likely involved in the idea of the bisexual Adam later in HA.

The concept seems most easily traceable in the Hellenic tradition. Indeed, among the roughly contemporary documents to the Gnostic literature, the most striking parallel occurs in Poimandres, where the bisexual first man, begotten in the image of the bisexual God begets seven bisexual offspring, who correspond to the seven Governors, also androgynous[107]. The usual supposition is that androgynous divinities were not creations of the Greek spirit, but were of Oriental origin. Yet the oldest Greek theogonies know of primeval beings such as Chaos, which, if not bisexual, are certainly asexual[108]. Greek art of the classical period provides examples of statuary depicting hermaphroditic deities. Marie Delcourt believes that these representations

---

[103] Cf. below on 135, 33—136, 1.

[104] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 5, 5 (ed. Harvey I, 49).

[105] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 3 (ed. Harvey I, 228).

[106] Alfred Bertholet, Das Geschlecht der Gottheit, SVG 173, Tübingen, 1934, p. 17.

[107] Poimandres 9, 16—17. See Nock and Festugière, op. cit., p. 20, n. 24, for a recitation of classical sources relating to a bisexual god. For a discussion of the subject in classicism, see Delcourt, op. cit., or O. Jessen, s. v. Hermaphroditos, PW VIII (1913), 714—721.

[108] M. Delcourt, Hermaphrodite: mythes et rites de la bisexualité dans l'antiquité classique MR 36, Paris, 1958, p. 28.

are purely symbolic, addressed to the spirit rather than to the senses. There is an esthetic involved which prevents their becoming the monstrosities which they would be if intended to be interpreted by the eye rather than by the intelligence[109]. Later, toward the end of antiquity, and with the increased contact of larger segments of the population with Oriental ideas, these symbols began to be taken seriously. The Orphic poets may have been the first to do this[110]. In Gnosticism, the symbols were no longer the servants of reason, but mythological entities[111].

Dietrich, who has provided the most thorough study of the motif of bisexuality in Gnosticism and its religious antecedents, is less willing to allow for Oriental influence. He narrows the place of origin down to Greece and South Italy, more specifically to Pythagorean and Orphic circles[112].

The religious concept of a primeval man bisexual in nature is common enough, but where is the origin of the bisexual planetary powers to be sought? In HA, Adam is bisexual since he is created in his bodily form after the bodies of the archons. Is it possible that the actual development of the idea was the reverse? Perhaps the archons who made man took on their hermaphroditic nature from their association with Adam.

It is important to notice that in HA the motif of bisexuality serves no soteriological function, as does the "transcendent sexual dialectic"[113] of The Gospel of Thomas or The Gospel of Philip[114]. The only interest here is cosmological, though it is the background for the later rationalizations. This appears to represent an older phase in the development of Gnosticism[115].

135, 29

Søren Giversen argues, on the basis of the four MSS of The Apocryphon of John and the researches of W. Gundel that the meaning of ϩO is not simply "faces," but "includes the entire being who bears the

---

[109] Ibid., p. 32.

[110] Ibid., p. 105.

[111] Ibid., p. 118.

[112] E. L. Dietrich, Der Urmensch als Androgyn, ZKG 58 (1939), 317.

[113] The phrase is used of the Gnostics but with no reference to these documents in particular by Giovanni Miegge, The Virgin Mary, trans. Waldo Smith, Philadelphia, 1955, p. 74.

[114] E.g., ET 82, 22—24; 99, 24—26; EP 113, 1—26.

[115] Dietrich, op. cit., p. 306, makes the important observation that in classical mythology the cosmological significance of the Urmensch was central, while in Gnosticism the interest became soteriological, and underwent a systematic development.

face, or, in other words, the shape or forms[116]." Krause translates "Gesicht[117]," but by further study of other sources, Giversen's contention gains strength. "Countenances" is here adopted as the translation in a purposeful attempt at ambiguity. Hesitance at adopting Giversen's thesis wholeheartedly arises from the fact that animalian heads and not bodies are found in artistic representations familiar from magical gems and papyri as well as from the paintings of ancient Egypt.

Origen, in Contra Celsum 6, 30 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 100, 4 sq.), a passage parallel to AJ II 11 (59), 26—34, says that in the Ophite system the first of the seven archonic demons was shaped like a lion[118]. On the form of Sabaoth, one of the seven in the "Gnostic" system described by Epiphanius, the heresiologist reports that some say the μορφή of this being was that of an ass, while others say it is of a pig[119]. In the Coptic Christian apocalypses, the punishing angels of Hell have animal shapes (though sometimes animal heads)[120]. It has been noted that it is only in the Coptic tradition that such a representation occurs in patristic writing, a strong indication for an Egyptian background[121].

Especially interesting here, however, is that the statement that the archons have animal shapes is combined with the assertion that they are bisexual, and both of these ideas apparently pertain to the fashioning of the body of the man. The sexual nature of man does indeed become important later in the document, but nothing is said about man being shaped like an animal. Still, in UW 167, 17—18, after Adam and Eve eat of the forbidden tree, part of their new awareness is that they saw they were in the shapes of animals: MMOPΦH NΘHPION. Further, EP 119, 22—26 relates that Adam ate from the tree of Paradise which produced beasts, and thereby became a beast. A very interesting passage is given by Origen in this connection, wherein he states that in Ophite belief some souls of men return into archontic forms, taking the shape of different animals[122]. Chadwick makes the stimulating suggestion, relative to this passage in Origen, that perhaps,

[116] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, p. 219. The reference is to AJ II 11 (59), 26—34 and parallels, and to Gundel's Dekane und Dekansternbilder, which was not available for the present study.

[117] Krause and Labib, op. cit., in locis.

[118] A special set of problems is connected with the leonine shape of the chief of the archons. See below, 142, 17 and note.

[119] Epiphanius Panarion 26, 10, 6 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 287, 15 sq.).

[120] Zandee, Death as an Enemy, pp. 330—331.

[121] L. Dudley, The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul, Baltimore, 1911, p. 65.

[122] Origen Contra Celsum 6, 33 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 102, 27 sqq.).

in Ophite worship, use was made of sacred masks, fashioned in the shapes of archons[123]. It is known that the worshippers of Mithra had such a practice[124]. The passage in UW cited above gives added possibility to this conjecture, but there is additional evidence.

E. R. Goodenough has published a study of a ten-sided amulet which in all probability is of Ophite origin, and which he dates, significantly, to the third or fourth century A. D.[125]. This artifact will be discussed in detail later, but at this point one of the sides is of interest. This face, one of the smaller, depicts what appears to be masks. Goodenough was able to offer no explanation of what they might mean, but in the light of this evidence, it is more than possible that they are cultic masks used in Ophite worship. Other faces of the amulet depict what are probably cultic objects[126]. In all probability, then, the animal shapes or faces of the archons played some part in Ophite worship. Perhaps man's sexual nature did, as well[127].

135, 30

For justification of the conjecture "their man," cf. below, 135, 34; 136, 1; 137, 18, and 139, 4.

135, 33—136, 3

For the lacuna of line 33, cf. 135, 24, 137, 4. 22, 140, 5, and UW 160, 33.

In line 34, πλάσμα means "something which is fashioned," and in itself begs no question as to the nature or gender of what that might be. English, unfortunately, has no similarly ambiguous parallel such as "Gebilde[128]," without resorting to words having a more weighted connotation in another direction, such as "fabrication," or "handiwork." In this particular context, the reference is to the archons' attempt to capture the reflected image and place it within their man, who is the πλάσμα. Hence it is rendered here "creature," but see the concordance for other references.

The tense of the verb "grasp" in 136, 1 is probably conjunctive, though it could possibly be a formation of ⲱⲀⲚⲦⲈ-, "until we catch it in our creation."

---

[123] Chadwick, op. cit., p. 349, n. 4.

[124] Cf. Jerome Ep. 107, 2, 2 (ed. Hilberg CSEL 55, 292, 2 sqq.); Franz Cumont, The Mysteries of Mithra, trans. Thomas J. McCormack, Chicago, 1903, pp. 152—154.

[125] Edwin R. Goodenough, A Jewish-Gnostic Amulet of the Roman Period, Greek and Byzantine Studies 1 (1958), p. 73.

[126] Ibid., pp. 76—80.

[127] See below, 138, 17, and note.

[128] Schenke, in loco. Cf. also concordances to the editions of AJ, and that of Böhlig and Labib to UW.

The pronouns in lines 34—35 could be translated as well by "he" and "his," but the reference is presumably to the image. The archons, not being able to catch the image in the water, determine to tempt it into a trap, the body of Adam, where they, the psychic, will be able to take possession of the pneumatic.

The word ⲱⲃⲣⲉⲓⲛⲉ, "co-image," occurs three times in UW, and once in AJ. In UW 158, 34, Adam's companion is thus designated, as in HA 139, 31. In UW 164, 1, it is Eve's companion. At UW 169, 29, it is said that the archons defile their own "co-image," as in HA 140, 25. In AJ the sole occurrence is in Codex IV 36, 1, in which it is said that Adam knew his Mitgestalt, as Krause renders the word[129]. The four MSS of AJ provide interesting material for the concept, however. The parallel to this latter passage in AJ II 23 (71), 9 reads simply ⲉⲓⲛⲉ, "image." The most arresting readings, however, are those of AJ III 30, 3, which reads συνουσία, and AJ BG 60, 3, which has simply οὐσία[130]. One might expect as an equivalent, rather than συνουσία, σύμβολον, originally a piece broken off an object to serve as a mutual token of recognition. In Aristophanes' relating of the myth of the androgyne in Plato's Symposium, each sex, i. e., each half of the original androgyne, is said to be a σύμβολον of the other[131].

In AJ as in UW, and later in HA, the word ⲱⲃⲣⲉⲓⲛⲉ is used of Eve, but this is not always the reference, and the translation must avoid such a misleading assumption. Schenke translates it as "Ebenbild." Since it is evidently a coined word, there seems to be nothing untoward in using an equally artificial "co-image." It must be distinguished from ⲉⲓⲛⲉ in translation, and it would be best to preserve the etymology in English if possible. "Counterpart," though it does suggest itself, does not exactly do this, nor does it seem as suitable as a coined word. Moreover, it is probably an overloaded translation technically.

Behind the use of ⲱⲃⲣⲉⲓⲛⲉ in HA is the mythical account of the division of the sexes from a primeval androgynous state, and the motif here at issue of the archons' attempting to reproduce or capture in their creation the image of God. For both of these circumstances "co-image" appears elastic enough to accommodate the interpretation, or some other interpretation by someone disagreeing with that offered here[132].

---

[129] Krause and Labib, op. cit., in loco.

[130] The word συνουσία can mean "sexual intercourse," and is so used in AJ (there are several instances; see the concordances), but at AJ III 33, 1—2, οὐσία is so used! Is there any such confusion of terms in HA 140, 24—25?

[131] Plato, Symposium 191 D.

[132] For the use of ⲱⲃⲣ- in compounds, see Crum, op. cit., p. 553b, and Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 197—198.

In line 136, 1, the possessive prefix ПМ, "our," was omitted and later inserted above the proper place.

The construction of 136, 1—2, "not [realizing,]" rendered here as circumstantial, also admits of being read as a second present: "They do not [realize.]" The phrase has the ring of an editorial addition, anticipating the result of the archons' machinations. The use of "God" here does not sound wholly Gnostic, and the Christian Gnostic editor may be responsible for its insertion[133].

136, 3—5

In this passage, "he" is evidently the Demiurge, who, by breathing into the man's face, endows him with his psychic nature. The only puzzle here is that it is not clear whether Samael is doing this according to his own plan, as in the Valentinian doctrine[134], or was tricked into doing it so as to be drained of his potency, as Irenaeus tells us the Ophites believed[135]. If the latter is the case, it is possible that in the preceding lines the archons are conspiring against their own progenitor. The inconvenient lacuna forbids certainty, but probability is on the side of the former alternative.

After man has been rendered psychic by the inflation of the Demiurge's breath, he is still prostrate and helpless on the ground[136]. The Spirit steals into him secretly later[137]. The body of Adam at this point lies on the ground spiritless, and because of the archons' weakness (lack of spirit), his creators are not able to make him rise, "for many days." In UW 163, 6—14, the Chief Archon leaves the body of Adam "without a soul" for forty days, at the end of which Sophia sends Zoe to imbue Adam with life. In AJ II 19 (67), 13—14, the work of the powers "remained completely inactive and motionless for a long time[138]."

The theme of Adam left insensate on the ground before receiving the breath of life is a familiar one. He is usually depicted by the Gnostic sects as unable to stand, and wriggling on the ground like a worm[139].

---

[133] Cf. the word "God" above in 135, 32. In the original myth, was it really God's image that was reflected?

[134] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 5, 5 (ed. Harvey I, 49) where man is made psychic. In 1, 5, 6. he is secretly made spiritual by the inspiration of Sophia.

[135] Ibid., 1, 30, 6. Cf. AJ II 19 (67), 22—32.

[136] Here, as in most of the sources, Adam's reptilian condition is to the frustration of the archons. In UW 163, 27—30, however, this delighted them!

[137] Cf. below, 136, 12—15. [138] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, p. 83.

[139] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 232) [Ophites]; Epiphanius Panarion 37, 4, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 55, 14 sq.) [Ophites]. The cause of Adam's state as the impotence of the powers is added in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 24, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 197) [Saturninus], and Hippolytus Ref. 7, 28, 3 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 208, 17 sq.) [Saturnilus]. Cf. also Right Ginza 101.

Hippolytus tells that the "Chaldeans," presumably meaning astrologers, held him to have lain motionless, still as a statue[140]. Similar references to a space of time between Adam's creation and his actual endowment with life are known from rabbinic literature, as well[141]. It is to be noted, however, that one familiar theme sometimes associated with Adam's lifeless state in rabbinic sources is missing here: the motif of the gigantic size of the first man[142]. The closest approach which HA makes to any similar idea is in the enormous aeon created by Ialdabaoth in 142, 35.

136, 6—8

The explanation of the simile of the whirlwinds may be that the archons were trying to blow breath, or spirit, into the creature. The LXX of Genesis 2, 7 has God blow the πνοή of life into Adam's nostrils; πνοή is an equivalent to THY, from which ϩATHOY, "whirlwind," is derived. If this is the reason for this strange figure of speech, it is one more instance of a word from the biblical text being accorded a strange new context in this Gnostic reinterpretation.

136, 10—11

The idea that the archons were unwittingly acting in accordance with a higher plan is spelled out further in The Gospel of Philip:

> The archons
> thought that it was by their own power and will
> that they were doing what they did,
> but the Holy Spirit in secret
> was contriving everything through them
> as it wished[143].

The comment that the events described are happening within the will of the Father interrupts the flow of the narrative in HA four times[144]. In each case it has the air of editorial insertion. The impression gained, just as in 136, 1—3 immediately above, is that the Christian Gnostic editor has taken a writing substantially polytheistic, and sublimated this aspect, by the device of reducing the divine and semidivine characters to lesser beings acting under the guidance of one Supreme Being.

[140] Hippolytus Ref. 5, 7, 6 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 80, 4 sqq.).

[141] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 8, 1; Fathers according to Rabbi Nathan 1. See also Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 79, n. 22.

[142] As reported of the Ophites in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 6 (ed. Harvey I, 232). Among rabbinic sources may be cited Bereshith Rabbah 8, 1; 21, 3; Midrash Tehillim 139, 5; for others see Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 79, n. 22.

[143] EP 103, 14—19, quoted from Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 31, 14—19; cf. W. Till, Das Evangelium nach Philippos, PTS 2, p. 15.

[144] At 135, 22. 136, 10—11. 136, 34—137, 3, and 144, 11—14.

136, 11—136, 19 The Spirit Comes to Adam

A very complex set of ideas is tangled in this passage. Although interrelated, there are two axes of thought: the etymology of the name Adam, and the Spirit which comes forth from the Earth.

Before these aspects of the passage can be elucidated, however, the relation to the narrative of UW must be discussed. The untitled document describes the creation of three Adams. The first is the appearance of the Light-Adam, Adamas, who is loved by the Pronoia[145]. This Adam is later described as pneumatic[146]. A second Adam is created by Sophia Zoe, a bisexual Adam who is identified with the Greek Hermaphroditus[147]. Later this second Adam is designated psychic[148]. Then a third Adam is created by the seven archons[149]. This Adam, confusingly, is described in loco as psychic, but is subsequently termed earthly (χοϊκός)[150].

While only one Adam is discussed in HA, he is reminiscent of all three Adams of UW. The first pneumatic Adamas of UW is seen in the HA passage as the Spirit comes up from the adamantine earth. As the Earth spread over him in UW, so the Spirit comes out from the Earth, in HA, to settle in him. The discussion which follows in UW 156, 25—31 regarding the earth's being cleansed by the blood of the Virgin[151] may have a bearing on the role of the Spirit in HA 136, 11—17, which, although in this passage grammatically masculine, is very difficult to separate from the figure of the feminine Spirit[152].

The second Adam of UW, by virtue of his hermaphroditic nature, recalls the episode of HA 137, 7—11. The fact that in UW 161, 34—162, 3 his son is "the Animal," meaning the Serpent, could conceivably have some remote reference to the account of Adam's giving names to the animals, found in HA 136, 19—24. By virtue of the fact that Eve is said in UW to be the Instructor as well as Adam's mother, the pericope of HA 137, 11—17 is recalled, in which Adam recognizes Eve as his mother. Also in the continuation of the UW passage in 162, 4—15, Eve, "the first Virgin," identifies herself to Adam in words very like Adam's recognition of Eve in HA 137, 11—17.

The third Adam of UW recalls Adam's being created of dust by the archons in HA 135, 26—27. It is this third Adam who moves helplessly on the ground until Sophia sends him her daughter Zoe, the Hebrew Eve, who awakens Adam, as in HA 137, 12—13.

---

[145] UW 156, 2—25.
[146] UW 165, 28—29.
[147] UW 161, 23—32.
[148] UW 165, 30—31.
[149] UW 162, 29—163, 3.
[150] UW 165, 33—34.
[151] See the discussion of Böhlig and Labib, Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel, pp. 60—61.
[152] This will be discussed later in this section.

Either a broad mythology has been condensed in HA, or the account of HA has been expanded, analyzed, and to some degree systematized in UW[153]. The latter is more probable for two reasons. First, the account of HA, from a literary point of view, is much closer to an obvious source of the myth: the Genesis account. The alterations, additions, and reinterpretations are less thoroughgoing than in UW. Here in HA, the Gnostic effort to reinterpret the Genesis story can be seen in an earlier, still emergent form. Second, the entire thrust of the Gnostic movement was from simplicity to complexity, from bare narrative to sophisticated philosophical interpretation, from myth to mysticism[154].

A Jewish background is apparent in the etymology of Adam's name offered in HA 136, 16—17. "Adam" is derived from אדמה, "earth," because the Spirit discovered him moving about on the ground like a snake. This derivation is not biblical, but it is found in rabbinic sources[155]. Alternate derivations of the name are offered in other sources. The Barbelognostics of Irenaeus' acquaintance derived the name from the Greek ἀδάμας, since they said he had never been conquered[156]. In UW 156, 24—25, a similar etymology of Adamas, the first, or Light Adam of that document, is offered on the basis of the same word used here in line 14: "the holy adamantine Earth." A more common explanation of the name in Jewish sources is a derivation from אדום, "red," or דם, "blood[157]." In UW 156, 22, the name is explained as "the Light-Blood-Man." This immediately precedes the lines telling of all the powers venerating the blood of the Virgin, from which the earth was cleansed.

Strikingly similar words are found in Josephus, who describes the "red earth" from which Adam was made as "virgin[158]." Adam's having been made from virgin earth is a common expression being found in writers orthodox as well as Gnostic[159]. There is not neces-

---

[153] It will be understood that the documents themselves are not necessarily meant, but the traditions which produced them. However, a detailed literary study would be of interest, and perhaps would be significant.

[154] Unfortunately, the complete edition of UW was apparently not available to Hans-Martin Schenke for the writing of his book Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis, Göttingen, 1962. There, the discussion of the Urmensch in UW (pp. 49—51) is only taken through plate 159 of Labib's edition, the portion which Schenke had previously translated for ThLZ.

[155] E.g., Midrash Tehillim 8, 2. See Gershom Scholem, Die Vorstellung vom Golem in ihren tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen, ErJb 22 (1954), p. 237.

[156] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 29, 3 (ed. Harvey I, 224).

[157] Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 72, n. 15.

[158] Josephus Ant. Jud. 1, 1, 2.

[159] E.g., Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 3, 21, 10 (ed. Sagnard SC 34, 370, 17—19); Tertullian Adv. Jud. 13, 11 (ed. Kroymann CC 2, 1386 sq., 60—62); 17, 4 (ed. Kroymann

sarily any mythological connotation in the expression at all; אדמה בתולה is a Mishnaic expression for unplowed land[160]. In the Christian sources, as applied to the earth from which Adam was made, it is interpreted to mean ground on which it had not yet rained, which had not yet been soiled with human blood, or which still contained no corpse[161]. Yet innocent as these expressions may be, mythology will flourish where such idioms are taken seriously, especially when transferred from one language area to another.

The idea of the "virginal Spirit" has been discussed already, with regard to 135, 11—14. It is important that in the passage here under discussion the Spirit is masculine. This may be a grammatical accommodation at the expense of the mythological background, which is clear enough despite the gender given the Spirit in this passage. Two interesting sections from The Gospel of Philip are relevant at this point.

> The soul of Adam
> came into being from a breath. Its
> consort is the spirit. The spirit which
> was given to him
> is his mother . . .[162]
>
> Adam came into being from two
> virgins, from the Spirit and from
> the virgin earth[163].

It has already been mentioned that according to Irenaeus the Holy Spirit was given the name "First Woman" among the Ophites[164].

CC 2, 904, 23—27); John of Damascus De Fide Orth. 4, 24 (MG 94, col. 1205/08). These references, and others, are discussed in a series of secondary sources. Cf. R. Köhler, Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams, Germania 7 (1862), 476—480; E. Nestle, Die 'jungfräuliche' Erde, ARW 11 (1908), 414—416; H. Vollmer, Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams, ZNW 10 (1909), 324; I. Löw, Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams, ZNW, 11 (1910), 168. These writers are not inclined to accept a mythological interpretation of the virgin earth motif as applied to Adam. For a writer willing to go to extremes, see E. A. Böklen, Adam und Qain im Lichte der vergleichenden Mythenforschung, Mythologische Bibliothek, Band I, Heft 2—3; Leipzig, 1907, pp. 7ff.

[160] Löw, loc. cit.

[161] Vollmer, loc. cit.

[162] EP 118, 22—25, quoted from Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 46.

[163] EP 119, 16—18, quoted from Wilson, Ibid., p. 47. It is interesting that this passage is followed by a Christological explanation of Adam's virgin birth, similar to that found in Passio Bartholomaei 5 (ed. Lipsius-Bonnet II, 137, 3 sqq.), Firmicus Maternus De Errore Prof. Rel. 25, 2. 3 (ed. Ziegler 73, 8 sqq.) or John of Damascus De Fide Orth. 4, 24 (MG 94, col. 1208).

[164] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 227); cf. Ibid. 1, 29, 4 (ed. Harvey I, 225 sq.).

There may be some connection of this Gnostic tradition with the legends known to rabbinic writers of a First Eve, a wife given Adam before the Eve of the biblical account[165]. In later Jewish tradition, this figure becomes known as Lilith, who was taken not from Adam's side, but from the Earth[166]. Interestingly enough, the idea that Lilith was a spirit of the wind was known in Jewish circles as late as the thirteenth century[167]. These considerations contribute to Scholem's conclusion that old Jewish tradition knew a chthonic earth-spirit, which dwelt within Adam[168].

Also relevant in this connection is the heresy of a certain Justin, as reported by Hippolytus[169]. In this system, there are three primeval principles: the good God, the father Elohim, and a female principle which is half-virgin and half-snake. This latter being is given two names: Israel and Edem. Scholem believes that "Edem" is a heretical Jewish confusion of אדמה and אדן (LXX: Εδεμ)[170]. He agrees with Lipsius that this figure Edem is the personification of the Earth[171]. In Justin's system, Adam received his spirit from Elohim, but his soul from Edem, the Earth[172]. It is worthy of note that here in HA 136, 15, although Adam has been described four lines above as psychic (ψυχικός), it is said that after the Spirit settled in him he became a living soul (ψυχή). This may be a reference not only to Genesis 2, 7, where God breathes into Adam's nostrils the breath of life so that he becomes a living soul, but to Genesis 1 24 as well, in which the Earth brings forth living souls (LXX: ψυχή)[173]. The biblical allusion is misleading. It must be assumed here, in harmony with Gnostic doctrine known from other sources and even evident in HA, that Adam is here being endowed with Spirit, not Soul. He is already psychic by virtue of the breath of the Demiurge, in 136, 3—4. Later, after the archons carry out their plan to create a woman from Adam's side, he is left again merely psychic[174].

---

[165] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 22, 7. See Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 87—88, n. 40, and especially Scholem, op. cit., p. 241.

[166] Cf. Ginzberg, loc. cit., and Scholem, op. cit., p. 241.

[167] Ginzberg, loc. cit.

[168] Scholem, op. cit., p. 242.

[169] Hippolytus Ref. 5, 26 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 126—132).

[170] Scholem, loc. cit. [171] Ibid.

[172] Cf. Pirke Rabbi Eliezer 12.

[173] Scholem, loc. cit. Following the LXX, the Sahidic of Genesis 1, 24 reads: ΜΑΡϵ ΠΚΑϩ ΤΑΥΟ ϵΒΟΛ ΝΟΥΨΥΧΗ ϵϹΟΝϩ. This is found in a Sahidic fragment of Genesis 1, 9—25 published by O. v. Lemm, Sahidische Bibelfragmente III, Bulletin de l'Académie Imperiale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, V, 25, 4 (1906), pp. 97—98.

[174] See below, 137, 10—11.

There are still further possible relations, which, though more remote, should nevertheless be noted. It becomes important that, in Justin's system, the Earth, or Edem, is half-snake. Later in HA, the serpent in Eden is described as the Instructor[175]. The idea is that the serpent instructs the first pair in true knowledge, or gnosis. However, in UW 163, 30—33, after Sophia sees that Adam is lying helpless on the ground, she sends her daughter Zoe, "who is called Eve," to Adam as an Instructor, to endow him with a soul[176].

Can there possibly be a connection between this Spirit which comes up out of the earth and the almost universal chthonic serpent deity? It is not completely out of the question. Philo of Byblos spoke of the serpent as "the most spiritual of animals: τὸ πνευματικώτατον τὸ ζῶον[177]." Baudissin attributes this idea of the serpent to Egyptian influence, on the grounds that the Greeks explained the Egyptian snake-god Kneph by πνεῦμα[178]. Horapollon speaks of the πνεῦμα which pervades the world like a snake[179]. Since the serpent appears later in HA as the bestower of gnosis on mankind, it is not unreasonable to find a similar idea involved in the occasion of man's equipment with a spirit[180].

It is to be noted that the instillation of Spirit within Adam is not described as the giving of a spark of light, as so often elsewhere, nor does the Spirit come from the realm of Light above, but from the Earth below[181].

136, 19—24 Adam Names the Animals

The only significant variation in sense between this section and Genesis 2, 19, which it obviously has in mind, is that it is here the archons rather than God who assemble the animals before Adam. Textually, the relation between these lines and the Sahidic of Genesis 1, 29 is not particularly close. Aside from the variations which are

---

[175] See below on 137, 32. The Aramaic etymology involved is very important.

[176] Further, see below on 137, 11—13.

[177] Philo of Byblos Frag. 9, in: Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum ed. C. Müller (5 vols.) Paris, 1848—1928, III, 572.

[178] W. W. Baudissin, Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte (2 vols.) Leipzig, 1876—1878, I, 270 n. 3.

[179] Hierogl. 1, 64; this source is cited by Chadwick, op. cit., p. 340, n. 2.

[180] For discussion of the snake as a beneficient chthonic spirit, see E. Gerhard, Über Agathodaimon und Bona Dea, in his Gesammelte Akademische Abhandlungen und kleine Schriften (2 vols.), Berlin, 1866—1868, II, 21—57. For further discussion of the serpent as a bestower of knowledge, see the note on 137, 31—32 below.

[181] Cf. Zandee, Gnostic Ideas, pp. 41—43 on the concept of the "pneumatic seed."

apparent even in translation, several words are used here which are synonymous to those in Genesis, but different[182].

There seems to be no more significance to the account here than simply what lies on the surface. In the parallel passage of UW 168, 17—169, 13, however, full use has been made of this episode also in the Gnostic reinterpretation of Genesis. There the archons use this as an opportunity to test Adam, to see how much knowledge, or gnosis, he had obtained from eating of the forbidden fruit. When they discover that he is indeed able to name the animals, they cast him out of Paradise, in words reminiscent of Genesis 3, 22.

In UW the story is displaced from its position in Genesis to fit after the account of the eating of the fruit. This enables the writer to give it the value of demonstrating Adam's wisdom. That the naming of the animals was such a demonstration, and even a test of Adam's wisdom is known from rabbinic sources as well[183]. In HA however, the story is only slightly out of order; it precedes the placing of Adam in Paradise, and thus serves the opposite function as in UW. The account of HA, devoid as it is of such a Gnostic interpretation, must be closer to a time when the biblical account of creation was beginning to be accommodated to Gnostic ideas.

136, 24—137, 3 Adam Placed in Paradise

136, 24—32

The account of Genesis 2, 15—17 is being followed very closely in these lines. For purposes of comparison, it is quoted here:

15. ΑΠϪΟΕΙϹ ΠΝΟΥΤΕ ϪΙ ΜΠΡϢΜΕ ΝΤΑϤΠΛΑϹϹΕ ΜΜΟϤ ΑϤΚϢ ΜΜΟϤ ϩΜ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙϹΟϹ ΕΡϩϢΒ ΕΡΟϤ ΑΥϢ ΕϩΑΡΕϩ.

16. ΑΥϢ ΑΠΝΟΥΤΕ ϩϢΝ ΕΤΟΟΤϤ ΝΑΔΑΜ ΕϤϪϢ ΜΜΟϹ ϪΕ ΕΒΟΛ ϩΝ ϣΗΝ ΝΙΜ ΕΤϩΜ ΠΠΑΡΑΔΙϹΟϹ ϩΝ ΟΥϢΜ ΕΚΕΟΥϢΜ.

17. ΕΒΟΛ ΔΕ ϩΜ ΠϣΗΝ ΝϹΟΥΝ ΠΠΕΤΝΑΥΟΥϤ ΜΝ ΠΠΕΘΟΟΥ ΝΝΕΤΝΟΥϢΜ ΕΒΟΛ ΝϩΗΤϤ ϩΜ ΠΕϩΟΟΥ ΔΕ ΕΤΕΤΝΑΟΥϢΜ ΕΒΟΛ ΝϩΗΤϤ ϩΝ ΟΥΜΟΥ ΤΕΤΝΑΜΟΥ[184].

The lacunas of lines 31 and 32 are supplied from these verses, and from HA 137, 34—138, 5.

The word ΠΑΡΑΔΕΙϹΟϹ occurs in HA sometimes with the article, and sometimes without. The practice has here been followed of

---

[182] A fragment containing Genesis 2, 9—23 in Sahidic was published by G. Maspero, in Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament, Mémoires publiées par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire, Tome 6, Fasc. 1, Paris, 1892, pp. 5—6.

[183] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 18, 4; Midrash Tehillim 8, 2. Further sources are given by Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 83, n. 29.

[184] Quoted from Maspero, op. cit., p. 5.

translating "Paradise" where the article is absent, and "the garden" where it is present. In the Sahidic fragments of Genesis, the article is consistently used, with one exception: at Genesis 3, 24 in Crum's publication[185].

In the Nag-Hammadi documents the article seems to be used with ⲠⲀⲢⲀⲆⲈⲒⲤⲞⲤ quite arbitrarily. Eight of the thirteen occurrences of the word in UW have the article. It is just as sporadic in The Apocryphon of John. The editors of these documents resolve the difficulty by supplying an article in the text where it is lacking. This course is not followed here, since the omission seems to have been a perfectly acceptable usage with this word; the text therefore stands in no need of correction.

The distinction made between articular and anarthrous use when translated "the garden" and "Paradise," respectively, may appear too sharply overdrawn, but use of "the garden" may find justification on the grounds that of the Gnostic accounts of the Eden story, this one is closest to the Genesis account. Halfway between this version and that of Genesis stands III Baruch 4, 8, in which God forbids Adam to eat of the vine which Samael has planted.

136, 34—137, 1

These lines and the two following are probably editorial additions[186].

Here the archons, with the purpose of denying gnosis to man, forbid him to eat of the tree of knowledge. But unknown to them, the Father was acting through them. It was the Father's intention that man should eat. The implication seems to be that the Father knew man would disobey an order by the archons.

137, 2—3

The preceding lacuna and a scribal correction in line 2 combine to present a severe textual problem. In line 2, the word ⲱⲡ which is retained in this text has been scored through, and the word ⲛⲁⲩ written in above; for the conjectured reading ⲉⲩⲟ, the MS reads ⲉϥⲟ. The question presented involves who it is that is to be regarded as hylic. As the text was left standing by the corrector, ⲛⲁⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲉϥⲟ, it must be Adam: "that he may see them, being (himself) hylic." But is it not the archons who are merely hylic, and jealous of the more highly endowed Adam? Is not the meaning that it was the Father's will that Adam recognize the state of affairs by eating of the tree knowledge, which was forbidden him by his jealous creators?

---

[185] A fragment containing Genesis 3, 16—4, 4 was published by W. E. Crum, Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum, London, 1905, p. 391. The same verse in Maspero's fragment, op. cit., p. 6, has the article.

[186] See above on 136, 10—11.

Now the original reading ⲱⲡ would make good sense with ⲉⲩⲟ, but not with ⲉϥⲟ. Reading ⲉⲩⲟ would make the text refer to the archons' hylic nature rather than Adam's. It would perhaps not be difficult in the course of textual transmission[187] for the letter ⲩ to be mistaken for ϥ in an ambiguous context, even though in this particular codex the distinction between the two letters is quite sharp. If this indeed is a case of faulty transcription, it accounts for the ⲛⲁⲩ being inserted, in an effort to improve the grammatical, sense. It seems best, then, to retain the original ⲱⲡ, and emend ⲉϥⲟ to ⲉⲩⲟ. Here ⲑⲏⲣⲟⲩ is read, since it seems to agree with the necessary emendation to ⲉⲩⲟ, and with the sense of the passage. Perhaps, of course, the MS itself originally read ⲑⲏⲣϥ in agreement with ⲉϥⲟ.

As an alternative way of accounting for the correction in the line, it might be conjectured that an original Greek verb such as συνειδεῖν lay behind the text, a word capable of being interpreted as either ⲱⲡ or ⲛⲁⲩ. However, the difficulty seems capable of explanation by the Coptic alone. A later hand, realizing that ⲱⲡ and ⲉϥⲟ did not harmonize[188], made a correction, but erroneously substituted another verb, so that the text continued its mistaken reference to Adam's being of hylic nature. Such a substitution of a different verb would be a less likely error on the part of an original copyist than an erroneous letter. Further against the originality of ⲛⲁⲩ, there is no good reason for a statement about Adam's seeing the archons being introduced into the text at all. He had already seen them. The will of the Father was rather that he should recognize them for what they were.

137, 3—11 The Archons Create Eve

137, 4—7

The word ⲃ(ⲱ)ⲉ, "forgetfulness," is used in Genesis 2, 21 of Adam's sleep[189]. It is another example of Gnostic reinterpretation of the biblical account, whereby the implications of "ignorance" are overlaid

---

[187] It is an open question just how long a life of textual transmission the documents known from Nag-Hammadi had. Since the heresiologists of the Church obviously had numbers of these documents, they must have been fairly widespread geographically as well as having a considerable longevity, although they did not last long enough to be committed to parchment, enabling preservation in some part of the world other than Egypt. This matter will become clearer when literary criticism has ascertained the editorial relations of the various writings. The four MSS of AJ suit it well for such study, but the highly sophisticated nature of its content sets is apart from others of the treatises, such as HA.

[188] The meaning would be, "and Adam would consider them, since he was completely hylic." Consider them what?

[189] Maspero, op. cit., p. 6.

on a word which by its ambiguity provides the opportunity for an eccentric understanding. The new meaning given it by the Gnostics is spelled out even more clearly in AJ [190]. Till translates the word, in a similar context, by "Erkenntnisunfähigkeit," which is descriptive, even if unwieldy[191]. Böhlig, at the parallel passage in UW 164, 21, translates "Vergessenschlaf."

By this device the archons plot to rob Adam of his higher, heavenly, or pneumatic nature. It is significant that this action directly related to the creation of Eve.

137, 7—11

This passage is best explained on the basis of the myth of the primeval androgyne. It is not specifically stated here that Adam was hermaphroditic, but from the intention of the archons expressed in 135, 27—28, it can be inferred[192]. Thus interpreted, it affords a cosmological basis for a phase of Gnostic soteriology expressed in sexual terminology.

The real origin of the androgyne myth as it gained influence in the Mediterranean world is quite obscure. There is a question as to whether or not androgynous deities were known in Egypt[193]. Some can find them in Semitic sources, though this can be disputed as well[194]. There is general agreement, however, that the myth in most cultures ultimately goes back to a lunar deity, a phenomenon explained by the waxing and waning of the moon's face[195]. Dietrich locates the point of dissemination, if not of origin, in Greece and South Italy, and attributes the popularity of it to revivals of Pythagoreanism and Orphism[196]. Krappe believes that the myth was native to the early

---

[190] AJ II 22 (70), 21—28.

[191] AJ BG 58, 13—59, 5; see Till, Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, in loco.

[192] Cf. UW 161, 23—32.

[193] See E. R. Goodenough, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (8 vols.) Bollingen Series, New York, 1953—1958, V, 176—177; and Zandee, Gnostic Ideas. p. 72.

[194] E.g., A. Jeremias, Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients, 4. durchges. Aufl. Leipzig, 1930, pp. 450, 524, 539, 730.

[195] Cf. the double form Lunus:Luna in Latin, and Clementine Recognitions 1, 69, 6. 3, 9, 7 (ed. Rehm, GCS 51, 47, 16. 51, 104, 6). See also Dietrich, op. cit., pp. 298—299; Bertholet, op. cit., p. 17; Jeremias, op. cit., p. 54. Böklen, op. cit., builds his book around this idea, seeking to prove that practically every element of the Paradise story can be laid to an original lunar mythology. There is a great deal of interesting material set forth in his work, but there is also much irrelevance, and uncritical straining at very dubious points.

[196] Dietrich, op. cit., p. 317.

Indo-European inhabitants of Asia Minor; he seeks to find traces in the Vedic literature[197].

At any rate, it is in the Greek tradition that literary evidence first becomes plentiful and indisputable. Empedocles knows the myth of a primeval bisexual man[198]. The locus classicus for the discussion of the idea is, of course, the Symposium of Plato[199]. Konrat Ziegler devoted an intensive study to the relations of the myth in Empedocles and Plato, concluding that both ultimately stem from Orphic anthropogony, which he in turn derives from Babylonian ideas[200]. This last conclusion is more debatable, but his study of the classical sources is quite thorough[201].

The important point to be drawn from the Hellenic use of the androgyne myth is that it serves only a cosmogonic function; no eschatology is involved. The general idea involved is the primeval unity of all things, but any eschatological return to the Urzeit is not expressed in the same metaphors. The classical writers never take the idea literally, or even seriously (Plato is an obvious example), and the philosophers treat it intellectually or mystically[202].

The idea of an androgynous Adam is found in rabbinic literature in connection with efforts to harmonize Genesis 1, 27, "In the image of God he created him . . . Male and female he created them," and Genesis 5, 2, "Male and female he created them . . . and named them Adam[203]".

The Sahidic of Genesis 1, 27 reads: ⲁ ⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟ ⲙⲡⲣⲱⲙⲉ ⲕⲁⲧⲁ ⲑⲓⲕⲱⲛ ⲙⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲟⲩ ⲟⲩϩⲟⲟⲩⲧ ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲟⲩ[204]. Genesis 5, 2 reads: ⲟⲩϩⲟⲟⲧ ⲙⲛ ⲟⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁϥⲧⲁⲙⲓⲟⲟⲩ ⲉⲣⲟⲟⲩ ⲁϥⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉϥⲣⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲁⲇⲁⲙ[205].

Speculation on the subject was undecided as to whether Adam's double nature meant that he had two faces, or that he was actually

---

[197] A. H. Krappe, The Birth of Eve, in: Occident and Orient . . . Gaster Anniversary Volume, ed. Bruno Schneider, London, 1936, pp. 316—321.

[198] Empedocles Frag. 61—62, in: Diels-Kranz (eds.), Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker (3 vols.) 9. Aufl., Berlin, 1960, I, 334—335.

[199] Plato Symposium 189E—193C.

[200] K. Ziegler, Menschen- und Weltenwerden, Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur, 31 (1913), 529—573.

[201] Many references can be cited; see n. 114 above on 135, 27.

[202] Dietrich, op. cit., p. 304; Delcourt, op. cit., pp. 32. 104—105; Krappe, op. cit., p. 316.

[203] Aquila and Theodotion corrected אתו to αὐτούς in Genesis 1: 27, Jervell, op. cit., p. 107. F. Schwally, Die biblischen Schöpfungsberichte, ARW 9 (1906), 159—175, argued that the myth of the androgyne actually lay behind the Genesis account itself, explaining the textual difficulties in these passages.

[204] Von Lemm, op. cit., p. 98.

[205] Wessely, op. cit., p. 34.

androgynous[206]. It is generally agreed that the impetus for this rabbinic theme derived from Greek Gnosticism[207]. One feature that rabbinic speculation on the androgyne has in common with the classical writers is that its function is purely cosmological. A facet of the creation story is thereby explained, and no eschatological conclusions are drawn from it.

The situation is different in Gnosticism. Here the old myths are taken seriously, and a new mythology has sprung up from the encounter of the Genesis account of creation with other ancient ideas. In some systems the mythological background can be seen with no reference to the biblical story. Such is suspected in the case of Simon Magus and his Helena. Here the female partner is identified with the ancient lunar myths[208]. More often, however, there is some connection with the narrative of Adam and Eve[209].

Eve's being separated from Adam at the beginning of human history had implications for the Gnostics which others did not draw. As in the classical use of the myth, the root idea is that of the separation of an original unity. Man is thus in a state of ignorant dividedness, and salvation is found in a restoration of the original state.

The idea is very clear in The Gospel of Philip:

> When
> Eve was in Adam, there was no death;
> but when she was separated from him death
> came into being.
> Again, if ⟨she⟩ go in, and he take ⟨her⟩
> to himself, death
> will no longer exist[210].

---

[206] E.g., Bereshith Rabbah 8, 1; 17, 6; Berakoth 61a; Erubin 18a; Midrash Tehillim 139, 5. On these sources and others, see Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 88—89, n. 42; J. Freudenthal, Hellenistische Studien (2 vols.) Breslau, 1875—1879, I, 69; M. Sachs, Beiträge zur Sprach- und Altertumsforschung aus jüdischen Quellen (2 vols.) Berlin, 1852—1854, I, 57; and especially J. Jervell, op. cit., pp. 107—112.

[207] J. Jervell, op. cit., p. 109; Dietrich, op. cit., pp. 313—315. Dietrich observes that the terminology used for the androgyne in the rabbinic sources is of Greek derivation. This interpretation of Genesis was known to Christian writers as well. Eusebius Prep. Ev. 12, 12, 1. 2 (ed. Mras GCS 43. 2, 101, 9—21) declares the Platonic myth to be a misconstruing of Moses; cf. also Augustine Gen. ad Lit. 3, 22 (ed. Zycha CSEL 28. 1, 89, 23—90, 7); Civ. Dei 14, 22 (ed. Dombart-Kalb CC 48, 444).

[208] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 23, 1—4 (ed. Harvey I, 190—195); see Bousset, op. cit., pp. 80—84.

209 E.g., Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 7 (ed. Harvey I, 233 sq.); Clement Exc. Theod. 21, 1. 2 (ed. Stählin GCS 17, 113, 18—27); AJ II 22 (70), 28—23 (71), 26.

[210] EP 116, 22—26; quoted from Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 44. See also Wilson's note on the passage, p. 134.

If the
woman had not separated from the man, she
would not die
with the man. His separation
became the beginning of death. Because
of this
Christ came, in order that he might
remove
the separation which was from the begin-
ning,
and again unite the two; and that he
might
give life to those who died in the sepa-
ration,
and unite them[211].

The "male-female" sayings in The Gospel of Thomas also fall under this interpretation[212]. In Valentinian theory it was said that the female, or spiritual, elements produced from the creation of male and female must be changed into male[213].

The passage in HA is capable of being interpreted along lines of the biblical story, the only difference being that the archons perform God's action. From its context in the document, however, and from its context in Gnostic theology, it is best interpreted as the primeval division of mankind into the two sexes. Certain linguistic observations lend credence to this.

Like the Hebrew צלע, the Coptic CΠIP can be translated "side" as well as "rib." This was the interpretation taken in those circles which thought of Adam as an androgynous being. Since this is apparently the context here, the word is so rendered in accommodation to this interpretation. It has, of course, been argued that this is the original significance of the Hebrew passage[214]. The Apocryphon of John, in all four

---

[211] EP 118, 9—17; quoted from Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 46.

[212] E.g., ET 22, 114.

[213] Clement Exc. Theod. 21, 2 (ed. Stählin GCS 17, 113, 24—27). Further on the idea of bisexuality in Gnosticism, see Zandee, Gnostic Ideas, pp. 72—74; Jervell, op. cit., pp. 161—165; A. F. J. Klijn, The 'Single One' in the Gospel of Thomas, JBL 81 (1962), 271—278; W. R. Schoedel, Naassene Themes in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas, VigChr. 14 (1960), 230; E. M. J. M. Cornélis, Quelques éléments pour une comparaison entre l'Évangile de Thomas et la notice d'Hippolyte sur les Naassènes, VigChr. 15 (1961), 99—101.

[214] As by S. Reinach, La naissance d'Ève, RHR 78 (1918), 185—206, and by Schwally, op. cit. The idea actually goes back to the Italian Renaissance, according to Krappe, op. cit., p. 312. To Böklen, op. cit., p. 23, "rib" is to be preferred, since the rib is a symbol of the new moon. Cf. also Jeremias, op. cit., p. 54.

versions, makes it a point that Adam's co-image was not made from Adam's ⲂⲎⲦⲤⲚⲒⲢ, "as Moses said[215]." This is an attempt to make explicit a distinction between ⲂⲎⲦⲤⲚⲒⲢ, "rib," a word derived from the arrangement of fronds on the stem of the palm[216], and ⲤⲚⲒⲢ, "side," or "rib." As a matter of fact, Genesis 2, 21—22, in the MS published by Maspero, does indeed read ⲂⲎⲦⲤⲚⲒⲢ[217].

Nothing resembling "like a living woman" appears in the biblical text. The interpretation which immediately occurs is that Adam is giving birth to Eve as a woman gives birth to a child. But there is another possibility. Perhaps the phrase ⲚⲐⲈ ⲚⲚⲞⲨⲤⲀⲒⲘⲈ ⲈⲤⲞⲚⲀ refers not to the archons' opening Adam's side, but to the side itself, i. e., the side of the bisexual Adam which was female. If so, there is still a question whether Adam's androgyny was conceived in terms of his being a bipartite creature, or an actual hermaphrodite. As the myth shows up here and there, both views are set forth, though this particular aspect seems never to have been taken into consideration in the studies[218].

There is some evidence that the Gnostic view of Adam was that he was considered hermaphroditic, having the genitalia of both sexes without having a male and a female body joined together in the fashion of Siamese twins. In the long passage describing the construction of Adam's body by various powers, AJ II 16 (64), 29 and its parallel in AJ IV 26, 4 speak cryptically of the formation of the "left penis." The surrounding context in both versions is either missing or ambiguous[219].

However, in the long series of bodily members, left and right, that are mentioned, the counterpart to "the left penis" appears to be ⲠⲦⲈⲦⲈ ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲀⲘ. Giversen renders this as "that which is [to the right][220]," but Krause sees ⲠⲦⲈⲦⲈ as a noun, and translates, "die rechte Gebärmutter[221]." Unfortunately, this is not self-evidently correct. Crum gives no such noun. Krause is apparently deducing the meaning from context, but it is not an unreasonable conclusion. Perhaps the word is related to the obscure entry in Crum, ⲦⲈⲨⲦⲈ, which apparently refers to some bodily organ, though an external

---

[215] AJ II 23 (71), 4 and parallels.

[216] Crum, Dictionary, p. 45a.

[217] Maspero, op. cit., p. 6.

[218] For the being with both genitalia, cf. Berossus of Chaldea Frag. 1. 4, in Müller, op. cit., II, 497. The bipartite creature is the idea in Plato, and is the conception of Rabbi Levi in the discussion of Wayyikra Rabbah 14, 1.

[219] The passage is not contained in AJ III or AJ BG.

[220] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, p. 77.

[221] Krause and Labib, op. cit., pp. 155, 225.

one[222]. In Giversen's reading, it seems that either the ⲡ or the ⲧ is unnecessary. Krause's conjecture certainly fits the context well, and gives the picture of Adam being initially equipped with the genitalia of both sexes, and not actually bipartite. It is interesting to notice, however, that the arrangement of the organs, male to the left and female to the right, is the reverse of the arrangement imagined by the Rabbinic writers[223].

All of this has a bearing on the translation of ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ in line 10. This could be rendered either "in her place," referring to the woman, or "in its place," referring to the flesh. The reference cannot be to ⲥⲡⲓⲣ, whether it be called "side" or "rib," for the word is grammatically masculine, while the possessive suffix in ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ is feminine. "In her place" thus becomes the most likely interpretation. But why "in her place" if a female part of Adam was not there beforehand?

In the Sahidic Genesis 2, 21, the same form ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ is used[224]. It is there properly translated "in its place," since the reference in that context is to ⲛⲟⲩⲉⲓⲛ ⲛⲛⲉϥϧⲏⲧⲥⲡⲓⲣ, "one of his ribs." Both the numeral ⲟⲩⲉⲓ and the noun ϧⲏⲧⲥⲡⲓⲣ are feminine, while ⲥⲡⲓⲣ, used in HA, is masculine. The word ⲉⲡⲉⲥⲙⲁ was appropriated from the biblical context, to be sure, but in this new grammatical context, created by insertion of ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛⲛⲟⲩⲥⲁⲓⲙⲉ ⲉⲥⲟⲛⲁ and the substitution of ⲥⲡⲓⲣ for ϧⲏⲧⲥⲡⲓⲣ, a wholly new reference has been given the possessive.

Jealous of the higher endowment given Adam by the Spirit, the creation of woman is the archons' attempt to drain him of that power. In separating the female from the male, they take the pneumatic out of Adam, so that he is once more only psychic.

137, 11—17 Adam Greets Eve

137, 11—13

The spiritual woman now comes to the psychic Adam, and bids him rise. This is obviously intended to be Eve, Adam's co-image, his better half, quite literally. Later in the document at 137, 31—138, 13, the spiritual woman is distinct from the earthly woman. In the guise of the serpent, the Instructor, she speaks to the earthly Eve. Still, Eve must be meant in this passage as well. In UW 163, 30—164, 3, in the account of the earthly Adam, Sophia sends her daughter Zoe to awaken Adam from his sleep. Zoe, it says, is also called Eve, deriving the name חוה

---

[222] Crum, Dictionary, p. 447b.

[223] Krappe, op. cit., p. 319.

[224] Maspero, op. cit., p. 6.

from חוא, the equivalent of ζωή[225]. This word play is extended to the words "Instructor" and "serpent" later[226]. The association of the Spirit with a feminine figure has already been discussed[227].

137, 13—17

Adam greets Eve with a speech, the confessional character of which can hardly be missed. It is to be compared with a parallel passage in UW 162, 8—15, where a more elaborate but strikingly similar speech is put into the mouth of Eve herself, in the first person. The quasiliturgical nature of the speech is even clearer there, where it is introduced by the words, "For this reason it is said of her that she said, 'I am . . .'"[228].

The form of this confession, especially as it is found in UW as Eve's own self-proclamation, is immediately reminiscent of the aretalogies of Isis; this was noticed by Böhlig[229]. The style in UW also suggests the Wisdom speeches of Proverbs 8 and Sirach 24. In connection with the Wisdom speeches and the Isis aretalogies, it is important to notice in UW the relation to the idea of instruction to Adam. In HA, of course, the words are in Adam's mouth, as a confession. As Isis instructs the worshipper as to her identity, so Eve speaks to Adam, and so Adam responds.

Böhlig also notes a reinforcement of the relation to Isis in that Isis also is found associated with the serpent[230]. This was especially the case in the Graeco-Roman period, with the popularity of the Isis and Serapis cult. The particular relevance of the serpent to the present episode will become clearer at 137, 32, at which place this theme will

---

[225] Cf. UW 161, 32—34, and AJ II 23 (71), 23—24. A unique fresco found in Libya, and dating from the fourth century A. D., depicts the Paradise scene, with the striking peculiarity that Adam's companion is labeled Zoe rather than Eve. This scene is the subject of L. Troje's study ΑΔΑΜ und ΖΩΗ; eine Szene der altchristlichen Kunst in ihren religionsgeschichtliche Zusammenhange, SAH Phil. hist. Klasse, VII, Heidelberg 1916.

[226] Cf. below, on 137, 32.

[227] Cf. above, on 135, 11—14.

[228] Böhlig offers a hymnic analysis of the lines in UW; Böhlig and Labib, Schrift ohne Titel, pp. 74—75.

[229] Loc. cit. Three of these aretalogies are easily attainable in Diodorus Siculus Bibl. Hist. 1, 27, 4—5; W. L. Knox, The Divine Wisdom, JThS 38 (1937), 230—231; A. Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East, trans. L. R. M. Strachan, 2d. ed., New York and London, 1911, pp. 136—137. A full collection is given by W. Peek in: Der Isishymnus von Andros und verwandte Texte, a work which was not available for this study. A bibliography of material dealing with the Isis texts is found in M. Nilsson, Geschichte der griechischen Religion. Band II: Die hellenistische und römische Zeit, HAW V, 2, 2. München, 1950, pp. 600—601, n. 2.

[230] Böhlig and Labib, loc. cit.

be resumed. Suffice it here to recall that Bousset speculated on the possibility of Egypt as the original locale of the Ophite Gnostics, reasoning from evidence of a Mother Isis cult located at Pharos, in which Isis was worshipped in the form of a snake[231].

This brings up once again the Ophite amulet studied by Goodenough. One of the figures on a smaller face of the object bears some resemblance to the ziggurat, or sacred mountain, but Goodenough, while offering no conclusive explanation of its meaning, does note that this symbol is sometimes found as a representation of the famed lighthouse on the island of Pharos[232]. This is a remote association, yet it is interesting to find it on an artifact of clearly Gnostic and probably Ophite provenance.

Aside from the association of Eve in this passage with the instruction theme and with the serpent, there has been recognized in Jewish literature a reaction against what apparently was a tendency in heterodox circles to identify Isis and Eve. There is a talmudic admonition against the representation of a wet-nurse holding a baby in her arms, since it is actually a picture of Eve nursing the world[233]. Christian sources are aware of a similar identification of Isis and Horus with Mary and Jesus, an idea which could have been mediated through the figure of Eve, but which at any rate could have easily associated itself with her[234].

It is to be noted that in Adam's speech here, the copulative particle is twice used, and a substantivized relative clause twice appears. In the first of these relatives, NTO ΠЄNTA2† NAЄI MΠ(ωN2, an impersonal ΠЄ is used instead of the feminine TЄ, which, interestingly enough, does appear in line 17, and in a clause of very similar meaning: NTOC ... TЄNTA2MICЄ. In line 16, the copulative particle appears twice, once as impersonal, NTOC ΠЄ TAMAAY, and once as feminine: NTOC TЄ TCOЄIN. In contrast, the passage in UW uses the copula ten times, and each time with all proper regard for grammatical gender[235]. The neutral ΠЄ is an older grammatical usage, which only at a later time in

---

[231] W. Bousset, s. v. Gnostiker, in: PW VII, col. 1539. Cf. also Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 79—83; Nilsson, op. cit., p. 602, n. 3; G. Roeder, s. v. Isis, in: PW IX, 2124.

[232] Goodenough, Jewish-Gnostic Amulet, p. 78.

[233] Aboda Sara 43a. The passage is discussed by M. Güdemann, Religionsgeschichtliche Studien, Schriften des israelitischen Literatur-Vereins, Jahrg. II. Leipzig, 1876, pp. 22—23; also Sachs, op. cit., I, 99.

[234] Güdemann, loc. cit., refers to the eighth century Chronicon Paschale. For a more thorough study of the assimilation of Isis and the Virgin Mary, taking account of artistic as well as literary evidence, see Miegge, op. cit., pp. 68—82.

[235] In the first phrase, ANOK ΠЄ ΠMЄPOC NTAMAAY, the paticle is masculine, in agreement with ΠMЄPOC.

the course of the development of the Egyptian language became differentiated into distinct forms signifying gender and number[236]. Although too much can be made of this, since the neutral form does continue into Coptic[237], it is possible that its use here in HA signifies that this is a traditional passage of some age, adapted to Eve, reworked grammatically, and elaborated in UW. Of course it could be an archaism, or the result of faulty transmission, since it is not used consistently. In UW 162, 6, NTOC ΠЄ NTAϩP COЄIN ЄPOC, the particle has the same liturgical air, although it is in the third person, and precedes Eve's actual self-proclamation.

In Irenaeus Adv. Haer. I, 30, 2, the two male principles, Father and Son, have intercourse with the First Woman, or Holy Spirit, whom they also call "Mother of the living." The phrase "mother of the living" is of course an allusion to Genesis 3: 20.

The sudden shift into the third person calls for notice. In a Sethian(?) magical document published by Worrell, a similar usage occurs. Worrell notes there that Coptic idiom "demands" the third person pronoun in direct address[238]. So the expression is at least not without precedent. On the other hand, there is a possibility of scribal omission raised by the ⲭЄ of line 16. As the text stands, it must be rendered "because," although Schenke omits it. But perhaps there once were words before the ⲭЄ like the CЄⲭω MMOC ЄPOC of UW 162, 7, which would parallel the CЄNAMOYTЄ of HA 137, 15; so that a better text might have read, "You will be called the mother of the living, and it will be said of you, 'She is my mother . . .'" In this case, the ⲭЄ would not have been causal, but a particle introducing a direct quotation.

"Physician," COЄIN, presents a problem because of its spelling and gender. Crum gives six variant spellings of CAЄIN, but not this particular form[239]. De Catanzaro, in his brief translated excerpt from HA, called it "fair one[240]," which seems to be a rather unlikely derivation from CAЄIЄ. That the correct interpretation is "physician" is shown by UW 162, 10, where the same spelling occurs, following a verbal form COЄIN in 162, 6, describing Eve as the one who healed herself. In UW

---

[236] G. Steindorff, Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik, Chicago, 1951, p. 139. Cf. K. Sethe, Das Verhältnis zwischen Demotisch und Koptisch und seine Lehren für die Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache, Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, NF. 4 (1925), 304.

[237] This is generally the case, however, where there is no clear distinction between the subject and predicate of an original Greek sentence; Steindorff, op. cit., p. 140. Cf. also below, on 141, 19.

[238] W. H. Worrell, A Coptic Wizard's Hoard, American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures, 46 (1930), 225, n. 1.

[239] Crum, Dictionary, p. 342b.

[240] De Catanzaro, op. cit., p. 69.

162, 10 the word is also feminine[241]. The spelling is surely no more than an Akhmimic variant.

137, 18—31 The Archons' Lust for Eve

This is the second of three times in this document that the motif of the lust of the archons is encountered, but this is the first time that explicit sexual overtones are added. This theme will receive more attention below in the section on the archons' lust for Norea, where this account has been curiously reduplicated. A close parallel to the episode is provided in UW 164, 12—165, 15. There the powers determine to cast their seed into Eve. She laughs at their plan, blinds their eyes, and leaving her image with Adam, hides in the tree of knowledge. The powers find the image and defile themselves with it, unaware that it is only an image. Abel and her other sons are born from that union. Genesis 6, 1—2 is an obvious background for this. The notion that Eve bore sons from the powers or from the Devil is familiar enough[242].

Puech, in a study of fragments of The Apocalypse of the Alien[243], quotes from Theodore bar-Konai the words there put into the mouth of the archons when they seduced Eve: "Venez, jetons sur elle notre semence et servons-nous d'elle d'abord, afin que ce qui naitre d'elle nous soit asservi." And again, "Ils conduissirent Ève loin du visage de cet Adam et ils la connurent[244]."

Nothing is said in HA about Eve bearing sons by the powers, nor is there any hint that Cain and Abel were other than the sons of Adam[245]. It is indicated, however, that as in UW the real Eve was left unharmed by the archons' action. Again a connection is suggested with the account in the Acta Archelai[246]. There the powers of darkness gain the shadow-image of the real Light, which escapes them[247]. Quispel interprets this image of the Light as the form-principle of matter; through the action of the powers, the creatures of the visible world are simili-

---

[241] Böhlig translates "die Ärztin," which is more appropriate than Schenke's "der Arzt."

[242] Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 7 (ed. Harvey I, 233); Epiphanius Panarion 40, 5, 3 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 85, 19—22); Pirke Rabbi Eliezer 21. See Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 133—134, n. 3.

[243] Known from Porphyrius, Vita Plotini 16; cf. Epiphanius Panarion 39, 5, 1; 40, 2, 2 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 75, 10 sq.; 31, 82, 13 sq.); here "Books" of the Alien are discussed.

[244] H.-Ch. Puech, Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse de l'Allogène, in: Mélanges Franz Cumont, AJPh IV (2 vols.) Bruxelles, 1936, II, 946—947.

[245] Cf. HA 139, 11—30.

[246] See above, on 135, 11—14.

[247] Acta Archelai 67, 4—12.

tudines[248]. "Seal" is also known as a circumlocution for "image[249]." At 137, 27 the reading AYXO2MEC is just as possible: "and they defiled it." This might be substantiated from UW 165, 13—15: "Das Abbild ist es, das auf alle Art die Mächte und ihre Engel befleckt haben[250]." However, AYXO2MOY has been read, with Schenke, since the context goes on to say that the powers were thereby condemning themselves. Further, the sentence preceding that quoted above from UW says, "Und sie irrten sich, weil sie nicht wußten, daß sie ihren (pl.)Körper befleckt haben[251]." Commenting on the passage, Böhlig states, "Unser Text betont, daß in erster Linie die Mächte sich selbst beflecken[252]." The shadow or image was defiled, of course, since the point is that the powers were eluded by the real Eve.

137, 31—139, 11 The Temptation and Fall

137, 31—32

The spiritual woman, addressed as Eve in lines 14—17, now comes in the guise of the serpent to speak to Adam and the fleshly Eve[253]. Irenaeus speaks of the Ophite idea that Sophia schemed to have the pair disobey Ialdabaoth's command not to eat of the tree, and used the serpent in her plan[254]. Others of the group, Irenaeus claims, held that Sophia herself actually became the serpent[255]. This latter concept is closer to the presentation of HA. It is not inconceivable, from a linguistic standpoint, that here the pneumatic woman comes "to" the serpent, so that the next line would read, "It instructed her." But it is surely the higher Spirit, Sophia, who is using the serpent to instruct the earthly pair in gnosis. The lacuna of line 33 is read "them," to accord with the plural of address used in the following lines.

---

[248] Quispel, Der gnostische Anthropos, pp. 199—200.

[249] The figure is a natural one, drawn from the impression made by a seal in wax or clay. Cf. Hippolytus Ref. 5, 19, 10 sqq. (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 118, 5 sqq.), and especially 5, 26, 9 (GCS 26, 128, 5—7) from Justin's heretical book, in which Eve is said to be the image and seal of Edem (on Edem see the note on 136, 11—19 above). More problematic is Philo's use of the term in De Opif. Mundi 134 (ed. Cohn-Wendland I, 46, 18 sq.); on this passage see Jervell, op. cit., pp. 64—66, 168, and R. Meyer, Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie BWA(N)T Reihe IV, Band XXII Stuttgart, 1937, p. 67.

[250] Böhlig and Labib, Schrift ohne Titel, p. 38.

[251] Ibid.

[252] Ibid.

[253] Cf. UW 164, 27—29, in which the spiritual Eve hides in the tree of knowledge.

[254] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 7 (ed. Harvey I, 234).

[255] Ibid. 1, 30, 15 (ed. Harvey I, 241). Cf. Epiphanius' confusion on this point: Panarion 37, 4—6 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 55, 8—59, 6).

Although Coptic words are used for both "serpent" and "Instructor," throughout the document, the relation between the two is found in an Aramaic background, where there is an evident play on the words חִוְיָא, "instructor," and חִוְיָא, "serpent." This is related in turn to the play on חַוָּה, "Eve," and חֲיָא, "to live," noted above[256]. The same word play is found in rabbinic tradition:

> And the man called his wife's name Eve—Hawwah, i.e., life. She was given to him for an advisor, but she played the eavesdropper like the serpent. [Another interpretation]: He showed her how many generations he had destroyed. R. Aha interpreted it: The serpent was thy [Eve's] serpent [i.e., seducer], and thou art Adam's serpent[257].

The snake in this passage is accomplishing something favorable to mankind. The biblical passage has been reversed in its meaning. Since man's creators in this document are, if not actually evil, ignorant, and have forbidden him to eat of the tree of knowledge, or gnosis, then the Spirit must invade the creation by stealth and tempt man to disobey the command, and attain gnosis[258]. That this was the will of the Father is explained in 136, 34—137, 3. The archons, in commanding Adam not to eat of the tree, called his attention to it. By virtue of their command, he was almost predestined to disobey. In the parallel of UW 166, 24—167, 6, the serpent, called there "The Animal," who is also son of Eve, tempts her with the same prospect.

A striking illustration of this doctrine is afforded by the Gnostic amulet published by Goodenough. One of the two main faces of the object depicts the tree of Paradise, Eve standing to the left and Adam to the right, with the serpent winding up the tree, his mouth toward Eve. She is plucking the fruit with one hand and giving a portion to Adam with the other. The most interesting observation to be made about the scene, as Goodenough points out, is that neither Adam nor Eve are shamefully covering their genitals, as in the traditional Jewish or Christian representations. The scene is one of triumph rather than shame[259].

---

[256] See above, 137, 11—13, and note.

[257] Bereshith Rabbah 20, 11, quoted from Midrash Rabbah, Vol. I: Genesis, trans. H. Freedman (2 vols.) London, 1939, I, 169—170. Cf. Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 90—91, n. 48.

[258] Origen Contra Celsum 6, 28 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 98, 10—13); Epiphanius Panarion 37, 3, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 53, 13—17); Pseudo-Tertullian Adv. Omn. Haer. 2, 2 (ed. Kroymann CC 2, 1403, 1—13); Jonas, Gnosis, pp. 221—223; H. Leisegang, Die Gnosis, Kröners Taschenausgabe, Band XXXII, Leipzig, 1924, p. 112.

[259] Goodenough, Jewish-Gnostic Amulet, pp. 73, 77. The face of the amulet is numbered 8 on the plate.

On the other main face of the amulet appears a coiled serpent in an omphalos symbol, surrounded by representations of the twelve signs of the zodiac, as well as the sun and moon[260]. Another smaller face shows what appears to be a small basket with an open lid, such as one may well suppose contained snakes for use in religious rites[261].

The snake, of course, is a proverbially wise animal, and plays the part of a clever one in many mythologies and folklores. In the Hellenic world one has only to think of the cult of Agathodaimon, widespread in the Hellenistic age, but generally associated with Egypt[262]. This was the deity termed "the most spiritual of animals" by Philo of Byblos[263]. The same writer also gives the information that Taaut, the Phoenician snake-god, was responsible for the invention of writing; he was founder of culture and science, advisor to the men of old, and god of intelligence[264]. Baudissin associates Taaut with Cadmus, who brought writing to Greece, and with whom the serpent was also associated[265]. This, he explains, is the reason for Taaut's unexpected connection with the serpent, for Taaut is the Egyptian god of Knowledge Thoth, one of few Egyptian deities with whom some serpent was not associated in some way. Incidentally, among the items which Isis claims for herself in the aretalogies is the invention of Demotic letters (as opposed to hieroglyphics)[266].

Asclepius, god of healing and medical practice, was associated with the snake[267]. Besides being a symbol of special kind of wisdom, it even recalls Eve's association with healing in HA 137, 16 and UW 162, 6. 10.

The serpent was already known in connection with the granting of wisdom to mankind before the Genesis story became a part of the

---

[260] Ibid., pp. 74—75; this face is number 2 on the plate.

[261] Ibid., p. 80, and figure 1. For use of such an object in Ophite rites, see Epiphanius Panarion 37, 5, 6 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 57, 12). The use of such a cista mystica containing a sacred snake was widespread in certain of the mysteries, such as the cult of Sabazios. Cf. the discussion of the object by K. Lehmann-Hartleben and E. C. Olsen, Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore, Baltimore, 1942, pp. 28—29, and the sarcophagus relief depicting the cista and snake, figure 7.

[262] Nilsson, op. cit., pp. 202—207; E. Saglio, s. v. Agathodaimon, in: Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines, ed. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, I/1 (1877), 131; Gerhard, op. cit., II, 22.

[263] Philo of Byblos Frag. 9, in: K. Müller, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum, Paris 1848—1928, III, 560.

[264] Ibid.

[265] Baudissin, op. cit., I, 270—275.

[266] Deissmann, op. cit., p. 136; Knox, op. cit., p. 230. Cf. above, on 137, 13—17.

[267] R. Pietschmann, s. v. Asklepios (2), in: PW, II, col. 1681—1682; L. M. Hartmann, s. v. Schlange (Mythologie, Kult), in: PW Reihe II, Band II, col. 511 to 512; Gerhard, op. cit., II, 24, 43—44.

gnostic system. One can easily see how the story was adapted, and which interpretation of the serpent had strong enough impetus behind it to force a change in the opposite source.

137, 33—138, 5

Unfortunately, no Sahidic fragment of the corresponding biblical passage is available for comparison. The most interesting characteristic of the quotation here is that there is an inconsistency in the use of number in address. The first statement of the serpent in this passage more closely parallels Genesis 2, 16—17 than Genesis 3, 1, as one would expect; hence the masculine singular pronominal suffix on the verb, as compared with the plural in line 4, although the serpent is speaking to the "fleshly woman." Maspero's fragment does contain Genesis 2, 16—17, and there, the command is masculine singular, while the threat is plural, exactly as here[268].

At line 7 the serpent's speech begins to parallel the Genesis 3 passage. Here as there he denies the threat, and gives as motivation for the command God's own jealousy. It is noteworthy that while in HA it is the archons who commanded Adam, the serpent speaks still of "he." This is either a reminiscence of the biblical original, not yet accustomed to this new setting, or a reference to the chief of the archons, who has special role delineated for him in HA's story of Paradise.

138, 6—10

Jealousy is here made a prime attribute of the creator of the world[269]. The sentence of lines 7—8 is surely a gnosticizing gloss making very explicit the new meaning being imparted to the passage. The serpent goes on to make what amounts to a promise of salvation in words which in the biblical text were the primeval lie.

138, 11—15

At this point, the Instructor, or spiritual woman, has accomplished her purpose, and leaves the body of the snake. The earthly Adam and Eve eat of the fruit.

38, 15—17

The reference here is to Genesis 3, 7, where the word "open" is used of the eyes of Adam and Eve. No Sahidic fragment of this passage is available, but the Bohairic reads: ⲁⲩⲟⲩⲱⲛ ⲛⲁⲉ ⲛⲉⲛⲃⲁⲗ[270]. The

---

[268] Maspero, op. cit., p. 5.

[269] In contrast to the Demiurge of Plato Timaeus 29E who makes all things as nearly as possible like himself, since he was without jealousy. Cf. above, on 134, 30—31.

[270] P. de Lagarde (ed.), Der Pentateuch koptisch, Leipzig, 1867, p. 6.

document is dealing with the Genesis text here in the way familiar from the Nag-Hammadi writings, seizing upon one word and structuring a new context from it[271]. Here, of course, the word is OYωN, meaning in the biblical citation "open", but in this new context, "derive from[272]." The same word, OYωN, receives a different treatment still in UW 158, 33 and 167, 12, where, after eating of the forbidden fruit, their "understanding" was opened.

Whereas in UW 167, 14—15, the first pair realize that they are naked of gnosis, here they become aware that they are naked of the spiritual[273]. This is not to be interpreted to mean that it was the act of eating the fruit which denuded them of the spiritual. It was rather that eating of the tree of knowledge made them aware of their true situation. In The Gospel of Truth Jesus passes "through those who, through Forgetting, were naked," and became knowledge for those who would accept his instruction[274]. The whole passage should be compared to AJ II 23 (71), 26—35, in which the Epinoia of Light awakes the thought of the pair when they realize their nakedness.

There is a possibility that more is to be seen in this association of nudity with the serpent than is readily apparent. Nakedness is associated, in some sects described by the Church Fathers, with the transcendence of sex necessary to salvation, and there is some evidence that cultic nudity may have played a role in the ritual of some of these groups[275]. Hans Leisegang has studied in detail the figures on an alabaster vessel, which he dates to the first century A. D., depicting a circle of naked men and women standing about a coiled snake in attitudes of veneration. He compares these figures with the ideas of Hippolytus' Naassenes that one must enter naked into heav-

---

[271] Cf. again Giversen, Apocryphon of John and Genesis.

[272] The same construction, OYωN ЄBOΛ 2N, is found in AJ II 28 (76), 21—22 and AJ IV 44, 7, where all sorts of iniquities arise from Fate.

[273] On the grammatical aspects of the phrase KHK A2HY, see O. v. Lemm, Kleine koptische Studien, XIII: Kω KA2HY oder KωK A2HY? Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg V, 13. St.-Pétersbourg, 1900, 35—44.

[274] EV 20, 34—21, 2; quoted from Grobel, op. cit., p. 68.

[275] On the transcendence of sex, see especially Hippolytus Ref. 5, 8, 41—45 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 96, 19—97, 23). Cf. ET 21, 37, and the comparative studies of the two sources by Cornélis, op. cit. pp. 91—101, and Schoedel, op. cit., p. 230. On cultic nudity see Epiphanius Panarion 51, 22, 9. 10 and 26, 4—5 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 285, 13 sqq. and 25, 280, 10 sqq.). Cf. the cultic unchastity of various groups mentioned in Epiphanius Panarion 27, 4, 5—7. 38, 2, 1 sqq. (GCS 25, 305, 9—306, 4 and GCS 31, 64, 4 sqq.) and Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 31, 2 (ed. Harvey I, 242). See also Moritz Friedländer, op. cit., who sees these orgiastic rites practiced by Jews of the pre-Christian era.

en[276], and associates the cult with one in which it was thought necessary to enter naked into the house of the Good God, the Agathodaimon. He believes the vessel to be Ophite, used in a mystery rite such as that described by Epiphanius[277]. Leisegang points out that cultic nudity seems to have often been connected with holy serpents[278]. That such ideas are in any way involved with the passage here cannot be proved, but circumstances are such that the suggestion can be made.

138, 18—19

The mention of the fig leaves is really unimportant to the course of events as interpreted in HA. Nothing is said in UW or AJ about Adam and Eve covering their nakedness, although at UW 158, 22 there is a mention of the fig tree, in a description of the tree of Paradise.

138, 19—21

At this point the chief of the archons, Samael, is singled out from the rest for the first time in the account of Paradise. His limitations are underscored: "He did not know what had happened." This statement serves also to indicate that the scheme to have Adam und Eve eat of the tree of knowledge was a plot against the Demiurge[279]. "Adam, where are you?" is the Sahidic of Genesis 3, 9[280].

138, 21—23

These lines are a condensation of Genesis 3, 10, which reads in Sahidic: ⲠⲈϨⲀϤ ⲚⲀϤ ⲚⲆⲒ ⲀⲆⲀⲘ ϨⲈ ⲦⲈⲔⲤⲘⲎ ⲦⲈⲚⲦⲀⲒⲤⲰⲦⲘ ⲈⲢⲞⲤ ⲈⲔⲘⲞⲞⲰⲈ ⲤⲘ ⲠⲠⲀⲢⲀⲆⲒⲤⲞⲤ ⲀⲒⲢⲤⲞⲦⲈ ϨⲈ ⲧⲔⲎⲔⲀⲤⲎⲨ ⲀⲒⲤⲞⲠⲦ[281].

138, 23—27

Nothing in Genesis 3, 11 is closely parallel to the archon's response.

138, 28—29

Adam's answer, however, is very close to Genesis 3, 12, which reads: ⲠⲈϨⲈ ⲀⲆⲀⲘ ϨⲈ ⲦⲈⲤⲤⲒⲘⲈ ⲚⲦⲀⲔⲦⲀⲀⲤ ⲚⲀⲒ ⲚⲦⲞⲤ ⲦⲚⲦⲀⲤⲧ ⲚⲀⲒ ⲀⲒⲞⲨⲰⲘ[282].

---

[276] H. Leisegang, Das Mysterium der Schlange: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des griechischen Mysterienkultes und seines Fortlebens in der christlichen Welt, ErJb 7 (1940), 216. Hippolytus Ref. 5, 8, 44 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 97, 16).

[277] Leisegang, Mysterium der Schlange, p. 208. Epiphanius Panarion 37, 5, 6—8 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 57, 12 sqq.). Cf. above on 137, 31—32, and note 276.

[278] Leisegang, Mysterium der Schlange, p. 221. His citation of Aelian de nat. anim. 11, 2 is probably mistaken, however; the γυμνὴ παρθένος in that passage is only a conjectural reading for γυνή.

[279] Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 7 (ed. Harvey I, 234).

[280] A. Ciasca (ed.), Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Copto-sahidica Musei Borgiani (4 vols.) Rome, 1885—1889, I, 1.

[281] Ibid.

[282] Ibid.

138, 29—30

Unlike the Genesis account, in which God questions the woman also, the archon curses her immediately after Adam replies to his question. Samael's proud independence, his jealousy, is mentioned again. The term αὐθάδης as a characteristic of the Demiurge seems to be sparingly used in the Nag-Hammadi documents. It is found at AJ II 13 (61), 27[283]. In Pistis Sophia it has become a proper name for one of the aeons[284]. Here it seems simply to denote a characteristic of the ruler of this world. Nowhere in HA does the Demiurge appear as a personification of actual evil. He is rather ignorant, blind, jealous, and selfwilled.

138, 30—31

The woman's reply is close to Genesis 3, 13, which reads: ΠΕΧΕ ΤΕϹϩΙΜΕ ΝΑΥ ΧΕ ΠϩΟΥ ΠΕΝΤΑΥΡϩΑΛ ΜΜΟΪ ΑΪΟΥѠΜ[285]. The Greek word ἀπατᾶν used in HA is found in the LXX.

138, 32—34

It is interesting that the third person plural is used here, presumably referring to the archons rather than to Adam and Eve. "His shadow" refers to the snake[286]. The archons assumed they were cursing the tempter of Adam and Eve, but she had already left the snake[287]. The lacuna of line 33 probably indicates their cursing that shadow although the serpent no longer was of any importance; they were not aware of what had really happened[288].

138, 34—139, 3

The sentence beginning "From that day on . . ." is probably a gloss added by the Christian Gnostic editor of the document. At no other point in this section is there any reference to the eschatological or prophetic implications of the events narrated. Especially interesting is that this gloss appears to presuppose a messianic interpretation of Genesis 3, 15, the so-called protevangelium.

Christ is the "perfect man" in The Gospel of Philip, which, as Wilson suggests, may be an allusion to Ephesians 4, 13[289]. This is striking, since the editorial introduction to HA begins with a quotation from Ephesians, and in the conclusion, which certainly betrays

---

[283] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, p. 71, translates the word as a proper name, although in his commentary, p. 234, he points out that it is not a proper name, since it is used with the article.

[284] PS 25, 38 et passim.

[285] Ciasca, loc. cit.

[286] Cf. above, 137, 26, and note.

[287] Cf. above, 138, 11—12.

[288] This seems more likely than Schenke's conjecture that the powerlessness is a result of the curse.

[289] EP 103, 11—12; see Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 79.

Christian influence, there is another allusion to that epistle. Even in this brief gloss, therefore, the editor has explicated the text with a reference to Ephesians[290].

139, 3—11

A reference is found here to Genesis 3, 23, which reads: ⲀⲨⲰ ⲀⲠⲬⲞⲈⲒⲤ ⲠⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ ⲚⲞⲬⲎ ⲈⲂⲞⲖ ⲤⲘ ⲠⲠⲀⲢⲀⲆⲒⲤⲞⲤ[291]. The key word is "cast," which is taken up and expounded upon in lines 7—11. Here is a classic example of the use of this term to express the character of human existence in the world[292].

139, 11—30 Cain and Abel

139, 12

A question can be raised as to who is meant by "their;" is Cain the son of Adam or of the archons? In line 13, the reference is surely to Adam. This, and the generally close manner in which the account of the brothers in HA parallels that of the Genesis account leads to the conclusion that both Cain and Abel are the sons of Adam and Eve. This is somewhat surprising. The idea was very widespread that Eve bore sons by the archons or by their chief; sometimes Cain and Abel are named[293]. The reason for the inclusion of this passage is hard to understand, since of the excerpts from Genesis given in HA, this alone seems to have no distinctively Gnostic interpretation given it. The only unusual addition appears to be the description of Cain as "fleshly" in line 20. But this marks no distinction between two Cains, as was the case with Eve. It simply assigns Cain to the lowest category of humanity in the Gnostic anthropology.

No Sahidic fragment of Genesis 4, 1—14 is available. A comparison of lines 11—27 with Lagarde's Bohairic text reveals some similarities, but nothing of importance[294].

---

[290] On the "perfect man" in Ephesians 4, 13, see Heinrich Schlier, Der Brief an die Epheser (4. Aufl. Düsseldorf, 1963), pp. 200—204.

[291] Ciasca, op. cit., I, 2; cf. Crum, Catalogue, p. 391.

[292] Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 63—65.

[293] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 7 (ed. Harvey I, 233—234); Hippolytus Ref. 5, 26, 2 sqq. (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 127, 3 sqq.); Epiphanius Panarion 37, 4, 4 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 56, 5 sqq.). 40, 5, 3 sq. (ed. Holl GCS 31, 85, 19 sqq.); EP 109, 5—9; AJ II 24 (72), 25 and parallels; UW 165, 15—18; Pirke Rabbi Eliezer 21. Other Jewish sources are given by Ginzberg, op. cit., V, 133—134, n. 3, and are examined in detail by Viktor Aptowitzer, Kain und Abel in der Agada, den Apokryphen, der hellenistischen, christlichen und mohammedanischen Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation, I, Wien-Leipzig, 1922. Sources in the Church Fathers are involved in the discussion of Puech in: Apocalypse de l'Allogène.

[294] Lagarde, op. cit., pp. 8—9.

139, 27—29

For the lacuna, see Genesis 4, 15: ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ ⲉⲧⲛⲁϩⲱⲧⲃ ⲛⲕⲁⲉⲓⲛ ⲩⲛⲁⲃⲱⲗ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲥⲁⲱⲩ ⲛϫⲓⲕⲃⲁ[295].

139, 29—30

For this lacuna, cf. LXX στένων καὶ τρέμων, and the Bohairic ⲉⲕⲉⲱⲱⲡⲓ ⲉⲕⲩⲓⲁϩⲟⲙ ⲟⲩⲟϩ ⲉⲕⲥⲑⲉⲣⲧⲉⲣ[296].

139, 30—140, 4 The Daughter of Eve

139, 30—33

The closest biblical parallel to these lines is the record of the birth of Seth in Genesis 4, 25: ⲁⲇⲁⲙ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲩⲟⲥⲩⲛⲉⲩ ϩⲁⲧⲉⲩⲥϩⲓⲙⲉ ⲁⲥⲱⲱ ⲁⲥϫⲡⲟ ⲛⲟⲩⲱⲏⲣⲉ ⲁⲥⲙⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲉⲡⲉⲩⲣⲁⲛ ϫⲉ ⲥⲏⲑ ⲉⲥϫⲱ ⲙⲙⲟⲥ ϫⲉ ⲁⲡⲛⲟⲩⲧⲉ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲧⲟⲩⲛⲉⲥ ⲕⲉⲥⲡⲣⲙⲁ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲉⲡⲙⲁ ⲛⲁⲃⲉⲗ ⲡⲉ[297].

Probably Seth is meant here, but in view of the importance given him by some sects, it is surprising he is not mentioned—unless his name occurs in the lacuna of line 31.

140, 2—3

The virgin whom no power has defiled is identified in The Gospel of Philip as Mary, in a context which militates against the idea that Mary conceived by the Holy Spirit[298]. Either this was a saying of some age, which the writer of EP brought into association with Mary, or the passage here is a gloss. The former seems more likely. The statement here is to be interpreted solely in its own context, in which it looks forward to the coming episode of Norea, but is reminiscent as well of the account of the archons' lust for Eve.

140, 3—4

"Became better" could be translated "became comely" or even "increased," with good reason. The basic problem is whether this line is an allusion to Genesis 1, 28 or to Genesis 6, 1. The possibility of a reference to the phrase, "Be fruitful and multiply," is raised not only by the use of αὐξάνειν (LXX: αὐξάνεσθε καὶ πληθύνεσθε), but by the fact that the word ⲁⲛⲁⲉⲓ is used in UW 162, 19 in an unmistakable allusion to Genesis 1, 28. αὐξάνειν is not used in the UW passage; two Coptic words are used there instead. Part of the problem is that a very similar word, ⲁⲓⲁⲓ, is used in the Coptic of the relevant passages. The Sahidic of Genesis 1, 28 is not available, but a fragment containing the identical phrase in Genesis 1, 22 has been published, and may be safely

[295] Wessely, op. cit., p. 34.

[296] Lagarde, loc. cit.

[297] Wessely, loc. cit.

[298] EP 103, 27—28; cf. Wilson, Gospel of Philip, p. 81.

used. Here God says: ⲁⲱⲁⲓ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲓⲁⲓ[299]. The Bohairic of both Genesis 1, 22 and 1, 28 is similar, although the two words are reversed: ⲁⲓⲁⲓ ⲟⲩⲟⲩ ⲁⲱⲁⲓ[300]. The similarity of the Sahidic passage to UW 162, 19 is striking; the latter reads ⲁⲱⲁⲉⲓ ⲁⲩⲱ ⲛⲧⲉⲧⲛⲁⲛⲁⲉⲓ. The allusion here to Genesis 1 is so strong, that in spite of the fact that the word actually used is ⲁⲛⲁⲉⲓ, Böhlig translates, "Werdet viel und vermehret euch[301]."

The Bohairic of Genesis 6, 1 uses ⲁⲱⲁⲓ, and in speaking of the daughters of men in 6, 2, ⲛⲁⲛⲉⲩ, "comely[302]." Further, the idea of "beginning" is in Genesis 6, 1 as well as HA 140, 3. Whatever may be said of the case for the UW quotation, the allusion in HA is to Genesis 6, 1, especially since in both HA and Genesis the reference is immediately followed by the account of the flood.

The problem still remains, however, whether the word ⲁⲛⲁⲉⲓ should be rendered with the meaning to be inferred from the Genesis passage, "became comely," or as done here, "became better." The former seems to have less significance, since the purpose is to describe man's state after the "Fall," which in this document is a Fall in reverse—an attaining to knowledge. The observation that men "became better," whether morally or in appearance is the pretext for the jealous malice of the archons in the next section. Once again a word meaning one thing in the Genesis context has been reinterpreted in the new Gnostic setting.

140, 4—18 Noah and Norea

140, 4—14

This section constitutes the first of three episodes in which the figure Norea appears. In each, she is representative of the Gnostic. Some confusion enters into this pericope, since the determination to flood the world comes from the archons, while the command to build the ark is issued apparently by the Demiurge, the "Ruler (ἄρχων) of the Forces (δύναμις)." This title suggests the similar designation in 143, 13—25 of Sabaoth, the repentant son of Ialdabaoth, installed by Sophia and Zoe over the forces of Chaos (δύναμις, χάος). If Noah represents the favorite of the Demiurge, and Norea the Gnostic, the account portrays the victory of spiritual mankind over the powers, as in the Norea episode immediately following. The archons are jealous and frustrated because of man's "becoming better," and attempt to destroy him. The archons' chief, however, determines to rescue Noah

[299] Von Lemm, Bibelfragmente, p. 97.

[300] Lagarde, op. cit., p. 3.

[301] Böhlig and Labib, Schrift ohne Titel, p. 77.

[302] Lagarde, op. cit., p. 12.

from his underlings, but Norea is determined to prevent this. The writer has thus interpreted the two actions of God in Genesis, causing the flood and commanding the ark, as referring to the contradictory actions of two different powers.

In line 14, an alien mythology intrudes into the flood account, having the ark rest on Mt. Seir rather than Mt. Ararat[303].

140, 14—18

The figure of Norea has as involved a religionsgeschichtlichen background as any figure in this document. She is the most obscure of its characters. Were more known about her origin and role in Gnosticism, perhaps more could be said about Gnostic origins. In HA, Norea plays three roles: the destroyer of Noah's ark, the object of the archons' lustful desires, and the recipient of the revelation from the angel Eleleth.

The name NϢPЄA is found at 140, 21 and 141, 6. Here it is ϢPЄA; at 140, 32, a lacuna appears just where an initial N may or may not have been written. In this line no attempt has been made to emend the text to NϢPЄA, and following the reading adopted, the translation reads Orea rather than Horea, as this version of the name is sometimes spelled[304]. The text is not emended because it seems clear that the omission of the N is not accidental, but rather, that the name was known in both of these forms. In one of the two appearances of the name in UW, at 150, 25, the N is omitted. Epiphanius recounts that the Egyptian Sethians held Seth's wife to be Horea, which is surely the same figure[305].

It is possible that Horea is to be preferred to Orea, but it seems unlikely, since the authority for aspirating the word seems to be no stronger than editions of Greek texts. Furthermore, had this form of the name been aspirated, Coptic, unlike Greek, had a means of indicating it readily available in the native letter ϩ, which it freely used in spelling aspirated words of Greek origin. Since the name is found in the Egyptian tradition[306] an accounting for its two forms may be sought in Coptic. The explanation may then be in the course of transmission in Coptic, whether oral or written, in which the multi-purpose particle N became attached to the name itself, obscuring its true origin. A very similar phenomenon has occasionally occured in English, as in the words "newt" from "an ewt," nickname from "an ekename," and the now archaic "nuncle" and "naunt" from "myn uncle" and

---

[303] See Doresse, Secret Books, p. 161, n. 27, and p. 180, n. 58.

[304] E.g., Doresse, Secret Books, p. 161.

[305] Epiphanius Panarion 39, 5, 2 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 75, 13 sqq.).

[306] See the next paragraph.

"myn aunt." If such indeed is the history of the word, it is unlikely that it was ever aspirated.

That Orea was known in Egypt as a proper name is demonstrated by a tombstone of the Augustan age found at Tell el-Yehoudiyeh. The inscription marks the grave of a woman named ωραια[307]. C. C. Edgar, who published these inscriptions, hints that the name is of Greek origin, but Leo Fuchs lists it as a name of Egyptian derivation[308].

The name as spelled Norea, however, is capable of being explained in various ways. Preuschen has suggested that the name has no real etymology, and was purely an artificial concoction such as many of the names found in Jubilees[309]. Yet such names were usually coined so that they sounded Hebrew. Others, such as Bousset, conjecture an origin from נערה, "girl[310]." However, the etymology offered by Epiphanius, while perhaps not the ultimate one, is surely involved in the tradition of Norea's burning Noah's ark with her fiery breath, as he recounted, and as is found at this point in HA[311]. Epiphanius derives the name from the Aramaic נורא, "fire," and compares the name and its meaning to Pyrrha, the wife of Deucalion in the flood story of Greek mythology, and whose name is derived from πῦρ, "fire." That the Deucalion myth was known to the Nag-Hammadi Gnostics is proved by The Apocalypse of Adam, in which Noah is referred to as Deucalion[312].

In addition to the mingling of biblical and classical mythology with an Aramaic etymology, one is perhaps able to go even further back, and seek a background in the lore of ancient Egypt. This would be particularly important if it could be established that the name is ultimately of Egyptian origin. The name, when given as Orea, bears a resemblance to the name of one of the archons given in some accounts of the Ophite system, Oraios[313]. The name is given with rough breath-

---

[307] C. C. Edgar, More Tombstones from Tell el Yehoudiyeh, ASAE 22 (1922), pp. 8—9.

[308] Leo Fuchs, Die Juden Ägyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit, Veröffentlichungen der Dr. A. S. Bettelheim Memorial Foundation. Wien, 1924, p. 149. As a Greek word it would mean "blooming" or "beautiful." One should consult the lists of similar names found in Egypt in Friedrich Preisigke (ed.), Namenbuch etc., Heidelberg, 1922, cols. 496—497. See also Fritz Zimmerman, Koptisches Christentum und altägyptische Religion ThQ 96 (1912), 595—596.

[309] Erwin Preuschen, Die apokryphen gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht, in: Festgruß Bernhard Stade, Gießen, 1900, p. 242, n. 2.

[310] Bousset, Hauptprobleme, p. 14.

[311] Epiphanius Panarion 26, 1, 4 sqq. (ed. Holl GCS 25, 275, 18 sqq.).

[312] AA 70, 19.

[313] Origen Contra Celsum 6, 31—32 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 101, 28 sqq./102, 19 sqq.); Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 5 (ed. Harvey I, 230).

ing sometimes, but it is important that in the listing of the archons in UW, the name appears as Oraios[314]. In Drexler's short discussion of this archontic name, most of the scholars cited (Matter, Baudissin, Lipsius), prefer a derivation from the Hebrew אור, "light[315]." One scholar, however, Rudolf Baxmann, is reported to have associated the name with the Egyptian uraeus, the cobra symbol of Lower Egypt[316]. Whatever linguistic considerations Baxmann may have adduced are considerably enhanced when his suggestion is applied to the figure Orea, or Norea. Just as Norea breathed fire against the ark to destroy it, apparently to spite Noah, one of the functions of the uraeus was to destroy the enemies of its wearer by annihilating them with its fiery breath[317]. The uraei are also features of the Egyptian underworld, where they menace the dead with their flaming breath, which becomes a punishment for sinners[318]. In later Coptic Christian literature, firebreathing snakes appear among the tortures of hell[319].

There is another possibility allowing for a connection of Orea with the Egyptian uraeus. In Irenaeus and Epiphanius, and indeed in HA, Norea is associated with Seth, the son of Adam and Eve[320]. It happens that the Egyptian uraeus was closely associated with Seth, the Egyptian deity.

This association is in turn relevant to the next episode in HA, which must necessarily be anticipated here. In it the archons attempt to rape Norea, much as it was the case earlier with Eve. The uraeus, as it is associated with the god Seth, represents the moon, which in its waxing and waning is viewed as being assaulted by Seth, but rescued by Horus. Seth represents darkness[321]. In the HA episode there is recognized, as in the account of Eve and the archons, a form of the myth in which the powers of darkness rape the moon-goddess. Böklen made an association of the moon with Pyrrha[322]. Such a myth was known to the Babylonians[323], and has in Gnosticism assumed various disguises, generally differing in the identity of the female figure. This

---

[314] UW 149, 33.

[315] W. Drexler, s. v. Horaios, in: Roscher, I/2 (1886), col. 2741.

[316] Drexler gives no specific reference, and I have been unable to trace it.

[317] Hans Bonnet, Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte, Berlin 1952, p. 845; Gerhard, op. cit., II, 22, 35.

[318] Zandee, Death as an Enemy, pp. 192—193.

[319] Ibid., pp. 333—335.

[320] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 9 (ed. Harvey I, 236); Epiphanius Panarion 39, 5, 2 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 75, 13 sqq.).

[321] Bonnet, op. cit., p. 846.

[322] Böklen, op. cit., p. 5.

[323] Morris Jastrow, Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens, Gießen, 1905—1912, I, 282.

is thought to be the ultimate background of Simon Magus and his Helena[324]. The Nicolaitan account of Barbelo's seduction of the archons, as related by Epiphanius, is similar, and if Bousset was right after all in his derivation of the name Barbelo from παρθένος, there is perhaps another association with Norea, who in HA is the virgin daughter of Eve[325]. In Epiphanius' account of Norea and Noah, Norea is also called βαρθενώς[326]. Filaster reports that the Nicolaitans worshipped Barbelo and Noria[327]. Bousset concludes from this that the two names must refer to one and the same personage[328], but we must agree with Schenke that this is not a necessary conclusion[329]. Further, regarding the association of Orea or Norea with the moon, it is at least interesting that in the identification made by Bousset of the seven archons of Ophitism with the heavenly bodies, the archon Oraios represents the moon[330].

The myth of the seduction of the archons by a feminine power is told in the Acta Archelai, in which the cause of human mortality is laid to the anger of the archons, when, after being tempted by a beautiful virgin, they are deceived by her[331]. The phrase of interest reads: παρθένος τις ὡραῖα κεκοσμημένη . . . In the light of the foregoing, it may be asked here if ωραια is really an adjective, as given in the Latin of the passage: "Virgo quaedam decora et exornata . . ." It is quite possible that this is a proper name, Oraia, the same figure as that involved with the lust of the archons in HA.

Norea is also known from Mandean literature, in which she appears as a minor character, the wife of Noah, though apparently once the wife of Shem[332].

---

[324] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 23, 2 (ed. Harvey I, 191). The linguistic association of Helena with σελήνη is often noted. Cf. Jonas, Gnosis, I, 363, n. 3. In Clementine Recognitions 2, 12, 1. 2 (ed. Rehm GCS 51, 58, 2 sqq.) she has the name Luna. See especially Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 77—80, who goes on to show that in Lower Egypt, and perhaps on Pharos, the figure of the Trojan Helen was combined with a native goddess, and was worshipped, interestingly enough, as a protectress against snakes. Cf. above on 137, 13—17.

[325] Epiphanius Panarion 25, 2, 2—4 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 269, 2 sqq.).

[326] Ibid. 26, 1, 6 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 276, 7 sq.). Cf. Bousset, Hauptprobleme, p. 14, and above on 135, 11—14.

[327] Div. Her. Lib. 33, 3 (ed. Heylen CC 9, 231, 8 sqq.).

[328] Bousset, Hauptprobleme, p. 14, n. 2.

[329] Schenke, Das Wesen der Archonten, p. 70.

[330] Bousset, Hauptprobleme, p. 10.

[331] Acta Archelai 9 (ed. Beeson GCS 16, 13 sqq.); cf. ibid. 67, 7—9 (ed. Beeson GCS 16, 96, 24 sqq.).

[332] Right Ginza 50, 381. See Kurt Rudolph, Die Mandäer, Teil I Prolegomena: das Mandäerproblem FRLANT NF. 56, Göttingen, 1960, p. 83, n. 1.

140, 19—32 The Archons' Lust for Norea

140, 19—20

Norea is not to be deceived by the archons' claim that her mother Eve had come to them. She possesses knowledge; she recognizes them as the powers of darkness, and knows that they had never succeeded in seducing Eve. The words which she speaks have the ring of magic. They strongly recall some of the magic spells and speeches of admission made by the soul to get past hostile powers, which are found in Egyptian sources. In these texts the speaker proves that he knows the hostile power by telling him his name; then he states who he is[333].

140, 27—29

"The Great One" is evidently the "arrogant archon." The idea of the wicked assuming a countenance black like a charred pot is known from the Coptic literature. In a sermon attributed to Athanasius, the godless, standing on the left of the seat of judgment, are described as having faces "black like a burnt pot;" ϵPϵNϵϒ2O KHM NΘϵ NOYϬAΛ2T ϵCΧHP[334]. Zandee gives examples from the Coffin Texts in which the soul speaks out against a demon called "black one of face[335]." It may be no more than a coincidence, but the contrast in the sermon of Athanasius is with the righteous, who "shine like the snow;" in HA 141, 15—16, the great angel Eleleth is clothed like the snow. The image is more immediately reminiscent of such biblical passages as Daniel 7, 9, Matthew 28, 3, or Mark 9, 3.

140, 32—141, 13 Eleleth Answers Norea's Call

141, 7—8

This line reads like a parenthetical gloss.

141, 8—10

The angel who has come from heaven speaks, identifying himself as Wisdom, who stands before the Holy Spirit. Eleleth, who in 141, 20 identifies himself as one of the four luminaries, is found elsewhere as one of this quartet[336]. Irenaeus' Barbelognostics had the four lumi-

---

[333] E.g., E. A. Wallis Budge, Egyptian Magic, Books on Egypt and Chaldea, Vol. II; London, 1901, pp. 174—177.

[334] J. B. Bernardin, A Coptic Sermon attributed to St. Athanasius, JThS 38 (1937), 126—127.

[335] Zandee, Death as an Enemy, p. 208. Cf. also Ep. Barnabae 4, 10. 20, 1 (ed. Funk-Bihlmeyer 14, 4. 33, 1), in which the Devil is ὁ μέλας.

[336] Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, p. 185, discusses the derivation of the name Eleleth.

naries surrounding Autogenes, the offspring of Ennoia and Logos, to whom everything was subject[337]. According to Irenaeus, four emanations are produced, to wait upon these beings, and the one assigned to Eleleth is Wisdom, φρόνησις, which in AJ is seen to be the equivalent of MNTCABϵ[338]. Also in AJ, the luminaries are associated with the figure of Autogenes, who in that document is Christ[339]. It is interesting that in HA the being on whom Eleleth waits is said to be the Holy Spirit.

141, 11—13

The meaning here seems to be that Eleleth is going to save Norea from the lawless archons by instructing her about the constitution of the higher worlds. This would mean that the story of the archons' attempt to seduce Norea is to be understood allegorically, that the rape of Norea would signify the submission of the soul to the archontic powers, a state from which one could only be saved by knowledge.

141, 13—17 Norea's Description of Eleleth

The sudden unexpected change into the first person is startling. By itself it suggests the welding together of literary components, and this may well be the case. The section which began at 135, 11 had as its purpose the reinterpretation of the primeval history of Genesis, following that story down to the flood. Now at this point the biblical story is forsaken; what follows is of a different literary type. It is the familiar revelation literature, in which a heavenly messenger reveals secrets of the other world to an earthly questioner. Its relation is with the summary section of 134, 7—135, 11 rather than with the section immediately preceding it. Even the introduction to that summary section resembles parts of the larger section beginning here. The encountering of the heavenly messenger by the questioner sounds like the beginning of an apocalyptic writing. Probably a Gnostic apocalypse has been welded into this document, but it is difficult to say exactly where it might begin. Line 32 of page 140 sounds logical. Perhaps the initial appeal against the powers of fate was connected in the editor's presentation with the struggle of Norea with the archons, and it is only at 141, 13 that the proper first person narrative is resumed.

---

[337] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 29, 2 (ed. Harvey I, 223). In Irenaeus, as in AJ, the luminaries are begotten by Imperishability and the Light, identified with Christ.

[338] AJ II 7 (55), 30—9 (57), 23. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 181 to 183, and Till, Papyrus Berolinensis, pp. 13, 18.

[339] AJ II 7 (55), 20; cf. Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, pp. 174—175.

Norea is playing her third role in this treatise as the recipient of the revelation. This raises the question, answered confidently in the affirmative by Puech[340] and Doresse[341], whether HA is actually the Book of Norea mentioned by Epiphanius or some part of it[342]. Schenke has just as confidently claimed that such an identification is impossible[343]. But Schenke's reasons for this are only applicable to the narrative episodes concerning Norea and Noah, and Norea and the archons. They have no relevance to the section beginning with Eleleth's appearance, but since Epiphanius also is only concerned with the content of those same sections, the argument holds good that far. But a Book, or Books, of Norea is also mentioned in the untitled document, and the indications are there that this Norea literature is similar to what is contained in the literary section of HA beginning here[344]. However, one searches HA in vain for the content which UW claims is found in the Norea books. Information regarding the heavenly host is found here, but not "more exactly," than in UW. Lacking quotations from a Book of Norea in other sources, it is impossible to decide the question, but it appears that the following section of HA was once an independent Revelation of Norea, but that it was not the same as that referred to by UW or by Epiphanius. Further literary analysis might perhaps be able to show a possibility that this section of HA was a portion of the book of Norea used by UW as a source, since much of the following material is paralleled in the untitled work.

Norea's confession of inability to describe the appearance of Eleleth has a close parallel in the Sophia Jesu Christi 78, 15—79, 2.

---

[340] Puech, Nouveaux écrits, p. 120.

[341] Doresse, Secret Books, p. 163.

[342] Epiphanius Panarion 26, 1, 3 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 275, 15).

[343] Schenke, Wesen der Archonten, pp. 70—71.

[344] UW 150, 11, 24—25. It is true, as Doresse points out (Secret Books, p. 163, n. 32), that these two places in UW, translated in Böhlig and Labib, Schrift ohne Titel, p. 47, as "im ersten Buche der Norea" and "im ersten Logos der Norea", could as well be understood as "the preceding Book of Norea." It seems rather unlikely, however, that mention is being made to a treatise which happens to precede the document in the same codex. For that to be true, it would have to be assumed not only that HA was indeed that document, but that the sectarians had a very strictly established canon, including canonical order, or that the whole codex was by the same author as well as scribe, or that the scribe took considerable liberty in inserting into the text of UW "footnote references" to the preceding treatise. Over against Schenke, however, who believes that the two references in UW are to different books (Wesen der Archonten, p. 71), Böhlig is probably right in assuming their identity (Schrift ohne Titel, p. 32).

141, 18—32 Eleleth's Words of Comfort and Norea's Request for Instruction

141, 19

In the saying "I am Understanding," formally speaking, the subject is TMNTPMNƧHT, "Understanding," since the copula is femine, pointing to TMNTPMNƧHT rather than to ANOK. The indication is of a special emphasis on the predicate, ANOK, "I." Comparison can thus be made with Bultmann's conclusion that the ἐγώ εἰμί sayings of the Fourth Gospel are Rekognitionsformel, in which the ἐγώ is predicate, and receives special emphasis[345].

141, 20—22

The idea of the four luminaries has been discussed above on 141, 8—10.

141, 23—26

The "root" appears again in connection with "truth" in 145, 14—16, at the closing of the book. The root is something to be known; knowledge of it is the promise of salvation in the latter passage. It is said that the saved will know the truth, their Root, the Father of the All, and the Holy Spirit. In AJ, the "Root" is Jesus[346]. If the Redeemer is meant by the Root in HA, he is probably the one who "appeared at the last time" in this passage, "on its account" referring then to the truth. The pronominal references in line 25 are otherwise ambiguous. Christian touches, or at least soteriological references, which hardly touched the long section recounting the Genesis history, are already entering into this section.

141, 26—28

"They," in this context, apparently refers to the root and to the truth. The reference to defilement, at least in the form in which the document stands, is a reference to Norea's rescue from the lust of the archontic powers. "That generation" refers to the generation of those who are not under the rule of the archons; they are the "kingless generation" of 145, 4[347]. In The Apocalypse of Adam the "kingless generation" appears, describing the coming Illuminator in a speech which follows the descriptions offered by thirteen "kingdoms[348]."

---

[345] Rudolf Bultmann, Das Evangelium des Johannes, MeyerK, 17. Aufl. Göttingen, 1962, pp. 167—168, n. 2; Steindorff, op. cit., pp. 139—141; cf. above on 137, 14—17.

[346] AJ II 31 (79), 16. Cf. EV 17, 30, and Grobel's note, op. cit., p. 47.

[347] Cf. Hippolytus Ref. 5, 8, 2 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 89, 9 sqq.), where "one mortal nature" is contrasted with "one kingless generation." See also above, on 134, 20, regarding the equivalence of PPO and ἄρχων.

[348] AA 82, 19—20.

141, 29

This line sounds like an allusion to John 14, 2. Further allusions to John occur in the conclusion; see below on 144, 33ff.

141, 30—32

Regarding the virginal Spirit, see above on 135, 11—14.

142, 2—19 The Creation of Pistis Sophia

142, 4—7

On the relation of Sophia and Imperishability, see above on 135, 11. Here, as in SJC 103, 7—9, the name Sophia is explained by the name Pistis. Interestingly, in UW 146, 13, the explanation is reversed; Pistis is explained by the name Sophia. In that document, she is often called simply Pistis, and at 154, 6 the name appears Sophia Pistis.

The concept behind Pistis Sophia's creation in these lines is closer to certain of the Valentinian ideas described by Irenaeus and Hippolytus than to the Ophite theory, to which so many parallels have been found in HA. Both of the sources describe Sophia's desire to procreate without the assistance of a male counterpart. By her attempt she only succeeds in producing a shapeless mass, like an abortion[349]. This is related to the current idea that the female gave substance to a child, but the male gave it form[350]. Sophia's private creation is also found in AJ II 9 (57), 31—10 (58), 7.

142, 8

The "images of heaven" may be the constellations. In the astrological context, Sophia's work is the heaven of the fixed stars, those which form the constellations. The creation following, that of the outermost planetary sphere, Saturn, becomes Ialdabaoth. The names of the other archons and their astrological identities are not important in HA[351]. The "image of heaven" is singular in the parallel passage of the untitled document[352]. Irenaeus' Ophites knew the idea, also, in a somewhat different form. There the power which descended from its mother Sophia formed the sky with its body, and was called a "female from a female[353]." The association of a female figure with the sky is

---

[349] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 2, 3 (ed. Harvey I, 16); Hippolytus Ref. 6, 30, 8—31, 6 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 158, 9 sqq.).

[350] The idea appears in the philosophers and medical writers as well. Cf. Hippo of Rhegius: "the bones are from the male, and the flesh from the female;" Frag. 13, Diels-Kranz, op. cit., I, 386.

[351] Cf. Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 10, 351—355; Baudissin, op. cit., I, 236.

[352] UW 146, 11—23.

[353] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 3 (ed. Harvey I, 229).

striking, since Egypt is the only locality in which a sky deity was considered feminine[354].

142, 8—10

As UW 146, 18—23 shows, the work of Sophia, the images of heaven, forms a curtain, dividing the world known to and seen by man from the invisible worlds transcending it, those worlds in whose form the worlds below are fashioned. The form of the curtain here is comparable to that of Horos in Valentinianism, or the firmament in the Basilidean system[355].

142, 10—15

Matter thus comes into existence from the shadow of the curtain, the firmament[356]. It gradually pulsates downward through Chaos, forming one celestial sphere after another as matter works its way downward[357]. It is this process that is the background for the statement here that the shadow was cast forth successively. The phrase AYCA NOYMЄPOC is surely an unnecessary redundancy. Behind it there may be textual confusion, probably dittography in a Greek text. Paralleling this passage, UW 147, 20—22, demonstrates the identity of the two terms, and illustrates much the same confusion, in a different manner. There Matter is cast into a CA (Böhlig supplies, "des Chaos"); then it is redundantly explained that Matter was in a MЄPOC of Chaos (this time "Chaos" appears in the text). It appears that UW is working with either HA itself, or its tradition, and is trying to explain a phrase that had already become misunderstood in the transition from Greek[358].

The phrase, either AYCA or NOYMЄPOC, is a reflection of the Greek idiom ἀνὰ μέρος or ἐν μέρει, "by turns." In Poimandres it is said, in very much the same context as here, σκότος κατωφερὲς ἦν, μέρει γε-

[354] Bertholet, op. cit., p. 5; J. A. MacCulloch, s. v. Earth, Earth-Gods, in: ERE V, 128. In speaking of the Egyptian sky goddess Nut, Edouard Naville says that she is to be compared to the Athena of the Greeks, with the female Spirit, with the divine Ennoia, and with the Ano Sophia of Gnosticism. See his La litanie de soleil: inscriptions recueillies dans les tombeaux des rois à Thèbes, Leipzig, 1875, p. 37.

[355] Cf. Wilson, Gnostic Problem, p. 203; Jonas, Gnostic Religion, pp. 300—301. On the use of the figure in Christianity, see Schlier, op. cit., pp. 127—132, on Φραγμός in Ephesians 2, 14. Cf. also Günther Bornkamm, Mythos und Legende in den apokryphen Thomas-Akten, FRLANT NF. 31, Göttingen, 1933, p. 29. In Judaism the curtain becomes the veil between the glory of God's throne and the angels; see Gershom Scholem, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism, New York, 1961, p. 72.

[356] Cf. UW 147, 17—22, EP 118, 1—2; 132, 23—133, 10.

[357] The process is described in Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 3. 4 (ed. Harvey I, 229 sq.).

[358] Cf. PS 27, 21.

γενημένον. Festugière translates this, "il y avait une obscurité se portant vers le bas, survenue a son tour[359]." The idea is that the shadow, material, gives rise to still lower orders of material being by successive emanations forming the concentric spheres of material existence, the planetary orbits and the earth[360].

In line 14 there is dittography: CMOYOYT for CMOYT. Here there may be some play on this word and MOYEI, "lion," of line 17, which is the particular "shape" which this matter first assumed.

142, 16—19

The leonine countenance of the first archon to come into existence is also found in UW 148, 7 and AJ II 10 (58), 9. That this archon is Ialdabaoth is clear from HA itself[361]. That Ialdabaoth was indeed conceived as lionheaded or lion-shaped is known from elsewhere[362]. Aside from literary sources, there are numerous amulets; of special interest here is the jasper pendant published by Campbell Bonner[363]. This object pictures a lion-headed deity clothed in an Egyptian apron, and carrying a small pail characteristic of Egyptian deities. On this face are inscribed the two names ΙαλδαβαωθandΑαριηλ[364]. The obverse lists the names of the seven archons in the order given by Irenaeus[365]. In this astrological setting the first-born archon must be the outermost of planetary spheres, Saturn. For the identification of Saturn, or Kronos, and Ialdabaoth, there is ample evidence, already adequately investigated[366]. Origen explicitly makes this identifica-

---

[359] Poimandres 4; quoted from Nock and Festugière, op. cit., pp. 6—7. See their note 8 on p. 12.

[360] By appeal to UW 149, 4—5, one might conjecture a meaning like "one part and then another."

[361] Cf. below, 143, 7—8.

[362] E.g., PS 28, 18; Origen Contra Celsum 6, 31 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 101, 11).

[363] Campbell Bonner, An Amulet of the Ophite Gnostics, in: Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear, Hesperia, Suppl. 8, Athens, 1949, pp. 43 to 46. This object is also studied in his Studies in Magical Amulets, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. 49. Ann Arbor 1950, pp. 135— 138.

[364] Cf. UW 148, 24—26. Ariel means "Lion of God." Can the Gnostics have understood this to be "leonine god?" Cf. the confusion on the interpretation of the name Samael, in 135, 3—4, and note.

[365] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 5 (ed. Harvey I, 230). Cf. Origen Contra Celsum 6, 31 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 101). The names are slightly different in AJ II 12 (60), 15—25.

[366] See Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 351—355; Baudissin, op. cit., I, 232; Van Unnik, op. cit., p. 79; W. H. C. Frend, The Gnostic-Manicheean Tradition in Roman North Africa, JEH 4 (1953), 19. The representation of Saturn as a lion in Mithraic art is involved here.

tion[367]. Tacitus, moreover, associated Saturn with the God of the Jews[368].

142, 19—34 The Blasphemy of Samael

142, 19—20

The infinite material which the archon sees is probably himself. In UW 148, 29—33, he looks about and sees his own enormous size (μέγεθος), and concludes that he alone exists[369].

142, 21—26

On the words of Samael's blasphemy and the words of the heavenly response, see above on 134, 30—135, 4. Whereas there the voice came forth from Imperishability, here it comes from the "height of Authority (αὐθεντία)." In Gnosticism, this word came to designate a virtually hypostasized divine being[370]. In its lexicographical history, however, it was very close to ἐξουσία in meaning, and it eventually became nearly synonymous with κύριος[371]. In Poimandres 2 the highest God is the νοῦς τῆς αὐθεντίας. The word came to play a large role in theological language, designating the character of the God who was not bound by physical law; speculation leading to hypostasization was a Gnostic enterprise[372].

142, 28—34

On Sophia's stretching out her finger, cf. UW 152, 3—4. After the blasphemy of Samael, his mother Sophia placed the vital light-element into material, endowing it with something not possessed by Samael himself. After this action, she herself returned to her light[373].

What then happened to the light which she had put into the material? The lacuna at line 34 may conceal the secret. Perhaps the darkness re-engulfed the light, but nothing is said about its re-entry. In fact, nothing is said in this section about the creation of man at all, and as mentioned earlier, it is a problem just where his creation fits into this picture. It is possible that Sophia by her action in line 29 is endowing man with the Spirit[374], but if so, it is stated proleptically,

---

[367] Origen Contra Celsum 6, 31 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 101, 11).

[368] Tacitus Hist. v. 4.

[369] Cf. 142, 34—143, 1.

[370] Cf. Hippolytus Ref. 7, 33, 2 + 10, 21, 3 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 221, 3 + 281, 13); Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 24, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 196); also Orbe, op. cit., p. 413.

[371] Albrecht Dihle, "Αὐθέντης," Glotta, 39 (1960), 79.

[372] Ibid., p. 83.

[373] The lacuna of 142, 33 is supplied on the basis of the parallel in UW 148, 28.

[374] In which case a different idea is presented than in 136, 11—19, in which the Spirit came from the Earth. Cf. Tatian Oratio 15 (ed. Schwartz TU 4. 1, 16, 4—6),

since in HA it has been said that all the archons had a part in making Adam, and at this point, only Ialdabaoth has been formed.

The word "again" of line 33 may be taken with the preceding sentence.

142, 34—143, 8 Samael Begets Offspring

142, 34—143, 4

Being androgynous, the archon can beget offspring of his own accord. The "infinite magnitude" is apparently the material out of which the other archons are fashioned. As mentioned above, in UW that μέγεθος is his own self. In Poimandres 2 it is an "endless vista" of light from which the pulsating shadow of matter emerges on its creative way.

Samael's androgynous offspring form the planets, but this makes eight planets in all, including Ialdabaoth himself. A better tradition may be represented in UW 149, 9—150, 11, since it speaks of Ialdabaoth creating only six bisexual offspring. But some of the other sources that can be adduced speak of seven, and the problem thus remains[375].

143, 4—8

The words of the blasphemy are somewhat different this time. Rather than the words of Isaiah being used, the Demiurge simply claims to be the God of the All, and it is not an exclamation that he makes to himself. He is telling this to his seven offspring. In this instance Pistis Sophia does not answer the blasphemy, but rather, her daughter Zoe. Of the three times which the phrase "You are wrong" appears in this document, here alone the Greek word is given in its active form[376].

Here, too, the name used in the accusation is different; Samael becomes Saklas. In Manicheism Saklas is found as a demonic being[377].

---

in which salvation consists of regaining what was lost at the Fall, a union of the soul with the Holy Spirit. Sophia's action here is reminiscent as well of the relation of Wisdom and man in the Jewish Wisdom literature.

[375] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 5, 2 (ed. Harvey I, 44) and Epiphanius Panarion 37, 4, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 31, 55, 10 sq.) speak of the seven. In Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 4 (ed. Harvey I, 230) and Hippolytus Ref. 7, 28, 2 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 208, 12) the chief of the archons seems to be included among the seven. Dr. R. McL. Wilson suggests, in a personal letter to the writer, that there may be two distinct theories in the background, one in which the Great Archon is among the seven, and another in which he creates the seven.

[376] Cf. above, on 135, 3.

[377] Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp. 15, 47, 345.

He is named among the demons in Epiphanius' report of the Nicolaitans[378], and Doresse identifies the Soclan of Hippolytus' excerpt from the Peratic source as Saklas[379].

In Aramaic סַכְלָא means "fool," which fits in well with the context. There is another root סכל meaning "teach." Perhaps the name is used here with some oblique reference to this meaning, since it is in Zoe's response to Ialdabaoth's false teaching to his offspring.

Saklas is interpreted to mean Ialdabaoth. This phrase recalls such New Testament passages as Matthew 1: 23, where a Semitic name is interpreted for Greek-speaking readers. However, the construction used in those passages involves a verbal form, never a noun. The same holds true of the Sahidic version. But the formula is also reminiscent of that found in The Second Book of Jeu: "His name is . . ., its interpretation is . . . [380]." Scholem sought to demonstrate that this formula results from a misinterpretation of the phrase in Hebrew, in which מפרש is not meant as ἑρμενεία, but as "secret name," over against the כנוי, or utterable name[381].

His idea seems to be borne out by the explanation given of the name Jesus Christ in The Gospel of Philip. Here the writer explains "Jesus" as the "secret name," because it is constant from language to language; "Christ," on the other hand, is a "revealed" name, since it varies[382]. The languages involved are irrelevant, but it is interesting in application to this passage in HA, that if Scholem is right, the "secret name," the magically efficacious name, is Ialdabaoth, against which Saklas is interpreted. Yet in the formula "You are wrong, X," HA itself supplies both Samael and Saklas. In AJ II (59), 15—18, the three names Ialdabaoth, Samael, and Saklas are attributed in one context to the creator archon. Both Samael and Saklas, as well as others, such as Michael and Ariel, may be popular names for the ordinarily ineffable name Ialdabaoth[383]. Scholem points out that in some circles the Tetragram was not the only unspeakable name[384]. Moreover, it can be observed that on the magical amulets and in the magical texts,

---

[378] Epiphanius Panarion 26, 10, 1 (ed. Holl GCS 25, 287, 2).

[379] Doresse, Secret Books, p. 51, n. 125, and p. 162, n. 30. Cf. Hippolytus Ref. 5, 14, 6 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 109, 16).

[380] In Schmidt and Till, op. cit., 308, 32. 310, 10, etc., where "interpretation" is ἑρμενεία.

[381] Gershom Scholem, Über eine Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften und ihren jüdischen Ursprung, ZNW 30 (1931), 170—176.

[382] EP 104, 4—9.

[383] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 9 (ed. Harvey I, 236) says that the serpent which was cast down has two names, Michael and Samael. Ariel appears as another name of Ialdabaoth in UW 148, 25, as well as on Bonner's amulet.

[384] Scholem, Über eine Formel . . ., p. 175.

Ialdabaoth appears far more often than these other names. Origen expressly says that Ialdabaoth was a name taken from magic[385]. The various other names may have been used to represent some particular aspect of Ialdabaoth's nature.

143, 8—13 The Punishment of Ialdabaoth

The obvious relation of this passage to more familiar literature, is with the binding of Satan in Revelation 20, 2—3, and his being cast into the pit of fire[386]. In Hippolytus, it is reported that in the Peratic system, Kronos, with whom Ialdabaoth is identified, was bound and cast into Tartaros[387]. In I Enoch 21, Uriel shows Enoch the fiery hell in which the seven stars of heaven are bound and kept. The flaming angel is not identified by name in HA, but it would not be surprising if Uriel (אוריאל, "Flame of God") were meant. Uriel, in I Enoch 20, 2, is the angel who is over Tartaros. In Coptic Christian literature, NOYN generally represents the underworld, and has connotations of hell. In that same literature, Tartaros is the deepest and most terrible region of hell[388].

But it is surprising to find a reference to hell in this context. So far all that has been related of the archontic history has been of primeval beginnings; the binding of Ialdabaoth has an eschatological ring. The matter becomes more puzzling if it is compared with Irenaeus' account of Ophite doctrine. There, after the story of Ialdabaoth's failure to keep Adam and Eve from the tree of knowledge, it is said that he cast the serpent down into this lower world. The serpent then begot six offspring; the seven of them were the seven spirits hostile to humanity. The serpent itself was called Samael and Michael[389]. It seems easiest to assume that Irenaeus has tangled several strands of Gnostic doctrine here. But what is meant in HA? Later Ialdabaoth appears again, begetting Envy and Death[390]. Still, it is hard to see how Tartaros can mean anything but hell here, or some region of it. The key to the problem may well be just where in the scheme of things narrated by Eleleth comes the creation of man.

---

[385] Origen Contra Celsum 6, 32 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 102, 19 sqq.).

[386] Cf. I Enoch 10, 4—5, where God has Raphael bind Azazel. In UW 150, 33, the "Troubler" is cast into Tartaros by Sophia's breath. It is not clear who this is; he does not appear to be Ialdabaoth. Böhlig suggests a Gnostic reworking of the Titan theme of classical mythology; Schrift ohne Titel, p. 47.

[387] Hippolytus Ref. 5, 14, 2 (ed. Wendland GCS 26, 108, 23—25).

[388] On NOYN and Tartaros as names for hell, see Zandee, Death as an Enemy, pp. 318—320. Cf. Acts of Thomas 32, in which the Devil, in the form of a serpent, identifies himself as the one who inhabits the Abyss of Tartaros.

[389] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 8—9 (ed. Harvey I, 236 sqq.).

[390] Cf. below, 144, 3—11.

143, 13—18 The Repentance of Sabaoth

Sabaoth is an archontic name taken from the Old Testament. Here, as the son of Ialdabaoth, he is awed at the power of the flaming angel. He has learned that what Ialdabaoth had claimed was untrue; he was not the God of the All, and higher powers than he did indeed exist. Upon realizing this, he repents. This shows him to be of psychic nature, since those of pneumatic nature and those of hylic nature have their destinies predetermined[391]. But how did Sabaoth come to have this psychic nature? In UW 152, 3—4, Sabaoth received Light from Pistis Sophia when she extended her finger. Perhaps this explains not only Sabaoth's capacity for repentance, but suggests an answer to the question raised above on 142, 28—33, regarding into what kind of material Sophia put the Light.

In this passage, "his father" is Ialdabaoth, and is not to be understood as "matter." It is not to be interpreted that "matter" was both father and mother to Sabaoth, yet this is not absolutely impossible, since matter is associated with androgyny in 142, 18—19. In UW 152, 10—11 it is said that Sabaoth came to hate his father, Darkness, and his mother the Abyss. In UW 151, 32—152, 1, the occasion for Sabaoth's singing praises to Sophia is his hearing the voice of Sophia telling Ialdabaoth of his inferior nature, after his blasphemy.

143, 19—144, 3 The Glorification of Sabaoth

The astrological equivalent to Sabaoth would logically be the planet Jupiter. The benificent functions associated with this planet fit Sabaoth's place in this document as well as the hostile nature attributed to Saturn fits the role of Ialdabaoth[392]. However, since Sabaoth is here enthroned by Sophia and Zoe over the seventh heaven rather than the sixth, these associations are somewhat obscured. According to UW 154, 25, however, Sabaoth had been relieved of his station in the sixth heaven.

The idea advanced is that the psychic Sabaoth has risen as high as those of psychic nature are able to go: to the seventh heaven, just beneath the dividing line between the aeons above and the aeons beneath. If the Valentinian theology is taken as a guide, Sabaoth is a figure of the Savior, who received from Sophia the spiritual element, becoming the first fruits of the saved[393]. Thus Zandee concludes that Ialdabaoth and Sabaoth represent the two choices available to the psychics, who are able to decide for or against evil[394].

---

[391] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 6, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 51 sqq.).

[392] Will-Erich Peuckert, Astrologie in: Geschichte der Geheimwissenschaften, Band I, Stuttgart, 1960, pp. 70—78.

[393] Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 6, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 52 sq.).

[394] Zandee, Gnostic Ideas, p. 51.

"God of the Forces" is evidently intended to render κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων, יהוה צבאות. A more exact interpretation is given in UW 152, 10, ΠΧΟΕΙC ΝΝΘΟΜ. There too, in line 8, he is "over all the forces (δύναμις) of Chaos."

As comparison with UW 152, 31—153, 16 shows, the chariot which Sabaoth makes is his throne, which is there also four-faced and named Cherubin[395]. In this description of the equipment of Sabaoth's throne, there is the closest approach of HA to the Merkabah mysticism of Judaism. The relations demand and require a full-scale treatment of their own, and no more can be done here than simply to suggest the subject. Nag-Hammadi promises to provide rich new material for research into the origins of Jewish mysticism[396].

Sabaoth also creates a host of angels to serve him, which he also does in the UW passage. This also suggests a connection of Sabaoth with Christ in Gnostic thinking, since in Sophia Jesu Christi it is Christ who creates such a band of angels[397]. But the association is not clear. In UW 153, 25—29, Jesus Christ is one of the created angels, who is seated at the right of Sabaoth's throne.

There are as well relations suggested with solar religion. In the magical papyri the God of the Jews is addressed as the Eternal Aeon who stands on the constellation of the Chariot near the Pole, and who can be addressed as Helios[398]. The figure of the solar chariot surrounded by the signs of the zodiac is known from synagogue art[399]. In UW 152, 25—26, Sabaoth is over the "twelve gods of Chaos," which must refer to the signs of the zodiac.

As mentioned above, in UW 153, 27—28 it is Jesus Christ who sits at Sabaoth's right; here it is Zoe. The instruction as to what is in the Ogdoad, the realm above the curtain beneath which Sabaoth is enthroned in the seventh heaven, is given him by Zoe in UW 153, 30, before his enthronement, and by Sophia in UW 154, 7, after the enthronement. The lacuna of line 33 here is supplied from these two parallels.

But it is possible that what is missing in the lacuna of lines 34—35 is the proper name of an angel. In this case the angel might not be the creation of Pistis Sophia, but one of those beings produced by Sabaoth

---

[395] The N in NXΘPOYBIN expresses equivalence. On the four-sided chariot-throne with its cherubim, cf. Ezekiel 1 and Revelation 4.

[396] On the subject, see Gershom Scholem, Major Trends, pp. 40—79; and his Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition, New York 1960.

[397] SJC 99, 18—100, 3.

[398] See Erik Peterson, La Liberation d'Adam de l'Ανάγκη, RB 55 (1948), 201 to 204.

[399] Goodenough, Jewish Symbols, I, 248—251; III, figs. 640—644.

himself in line 28. In UW 153, 20—26, after Sabaoth creates his church of innumerable angels, two of these are singled out: Israel and Jesus Christ. The latter takes his place at Sabaoth's right, while it is the virgin Holy Spirit who sits at his left. In that account, two benevolent powers are seated at either side of the throne. However, there is a curious doubling of the account, and in a second scene, UW 154, 11—18, Zoe sits at the right, as she does in HA, but Ialdabaoth is seated at the left. This idea is closer to that expressed in HA, for the context goes on in 143, 35—144, 3 to indicate that the right side is considered good, while the left is bad. The language is very similar to UW 154, 14—16, from which the lacuna of lines 35—36 here has been restored. It is clear, then, that whoever the angel is at Sabaoth's right hand, it is a malevolent being, and this hardly agrees with the function of the "flaming angel" who bound Ialdabaoth and cast him into Tartaros.

The symbolism of right and left as evil and good is too universal to deserve comment. Within Gnosticism, the doctrine of the good angels of the right and the evil angels of the left was popular[400].

144, 3—14 The Envy of Ialdabaoth

Ialdabaoth, who was last mentioned as being bound in Tartaros, envies the high station of his son Sabaoth, who had been endowed with a psychic nature capable of elevation. His envy takes on an existence of its own, and in its turn gives rise to Death[401]. Death then begets other beings, which are given stations in the heavens. It is ambiguous whether Death or Ialdabaoth installed them there. In this way regardless, the stations in Chaos were filled, according to the will of the Father of the All, everything below corresponding to its prototype above.

A close parallel passage in UW 154, 19—155, 7 is more detailed in its explanation. There the other beings brought forth are given names, those of human passion such as Anger, Lust, and Grief. There too they are considered androgynous.

144, 14—31 Eleleth's Reassurance

With the filling up of Chaos with the powers, Eleleth has answered Norea's question of 141, 32—142, 2. He has instructed her in the

[400] Cf. Clement Exc. Theod. 23, 3 (ed. Stählin GCS 17, 114, 22 sqq.); Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 6, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 51); Origen Contra Celsum 6, 27 (ed. Koetschau GCS 3, 97, 8). There are many such references. For the idea in Cabbalistic literature, see Scholem, Major Trends, p. 239, where Samael is "the left side."

[401] In Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 30, 9 (ed. Harvey I, 236), envy and death are linked together as the legacy of Cain's murder of Abel.

origin, nature, and realm of the archons. She has learned, as Adam did by eating of the tree, that they are hylic[402]. But she is concerned lest she be included among the hylic, too[403]. Eleleth then assures her that her soul, and the souls of her offspring, come from the Light; they have been endowed with Spirit. Because of this, the powers will not be able to "approach" them. This last may be another reference to the incident which provoked the revelation, the attempt of the archons to ravish Norea. Perhaps T2NO is the equivalent of τολμᾶν in that section. Norea is thus assured that she is counted among the immortal, who, by knowledge, have become essentially different in destiny from the mortal men about them.

The promise of a coming "Seed" is evidently an eschatological saying, and the reference may again be to Genesis 3, 15. One allusion to the protevangelium has already been seen in HA, at 138, 34—139, 2[404]. As suggested in Exc. Theod. 28 (ed. Stählin GCS 17, 116, 18—22), the intermediate period of three generations may be derived from Deuteronomy 5, 9, in which the Lord proclaims himself a jealous God, holding the children responsible for the fathers' sins unto the third and fourth generation. During the three generations, then, the jealous God exercises his power, but at the fourth, the rescuing Seed will be revealed. The fourth generation, then, would be the "kingless" one, the generation of those freed from archontic bondage. But perhaps it is the third generation that is meant as the climactic time of the Redeemer. In this case the passage may not be intended to be interpreted chronologically at all; the "three generations" in UW 170, 6—9 are three kinds of men: pneumatic, psychic, and hylic[405].

Whom the Seed rescues is not clear; the reference may be to the "immortal" of line 26.

144, 33—145, 23 Conclusion

Norea asks how long it will be until this revelation. Eleleth responds in language that is distinctly Johannine. The coming one is called ἀληθινός[406]. The description of the Spirit of Truth recalls John 14, 17. 26. John 14, 2 seemed to be alluded to in 141, 29, also in a section in which the angel Eleleth was giving comfort to Norea. Further, the

---

[402] Cf. above, 136, 34—137, 3.

[403] On being "counted among the number" as an expression in the Coptic Christian literature, see Zandee, Death as an Enemy, p. 338.

[404] On the "Seed" in Manicheeism, see Henri-Charles Puech, Le Manichéisme . . ., Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Diffusion 56, Paris, 1949, pp. 160—161.

[405] In Manicheean doctrine, the "third time" is the eschatological act ending Time, cf. Puech, Manichéisme, pp. 84—85.

[406] Cf. the "True Man" of UW 165, 11; 171, 24.

mention of anointing in the context of instruction is an unmistakable allusion to I John 2, 20. 27, in which the anointing of the Holy One teaches about all things. There seems to be no play on the word χρῖσμα, as in EP 122, 12—16, and any reference to a Gnostic sacrament of chrism is only oblique. Eleleth's words are rather a loose catena of Johannine references.

The casting away of blind thought is also found in the First Apocalypse of James 27, 4—5.

Of the death of the powers and the accompanying grief of the archons, mention is made in UW 173, 34—174, 4. The passage in both documents evidently refers to the end of this age. Zandee quotes a Christian Coptic source with a similar idea: "May the darkness recede. . . . Let the archons be destroyed and let the powers of darkness recede upon the earth[407]." In line 7, the literal reading is, "they will trample the death of the powers," as Schenke has also read. If the import is as the translation here suggests, the strange Coptic order may perhaps be explained by some Greek Vorlage such as καταπατήσουσι εἰς θάνατον τὰς ἐξουσίας[408].

The "indeed" of line 14 translates ϩN̄ OYMЄ of line 15, understanding the expression to be adverbial rather than descriptive of the "root:" "their root in truth." The "root" is here combined with the Father and the Holy Spirit into a Trinitarian formula[409].

The redeemed "sons of light" voice their praise with words that are once more reminiscent of Ephesians. Over against Schenke, who interprets OYON NIM to be neuter along with ΠΠΗΡϤ, "über allem und durch alles[410]," it is here taken to be masculine and therefore personal, as is indeed its usual meaning[411]. The reference to Ephesians 4, 6 has the document end as well as begin with an allusion to that book. In the Greek of that verse, the gender is likewise ambiguous: ἐπὶ πάντων, διὰ πάντων, ἐν πᾶσιν. The Sahidic reads: ЄⲦϩIⲰN OYON NIM AYⲰ ЄBOⲖ ϩITOOTOY THPOY ЄϤϩM ΠΠΗΡϤ[412]. There the first member, OYON NIM, is quite probably masculine, the second plural and probably personal, and the third, ΠΠΗΡϤ, ambiguous but probably neuter.

It is interesting that in the phrase "forever and ever" of line 20, Coptic words are used instead of the Greek formula. This may be to avoid confusion with the Gnostic connotations of the word αἰών[413].

---

[407] Zandee, Death as an Enemy, p. 324.

[408] This idea was suggested by Dr. Grobel.

[409] Cf. above, on 141, 23—25.

[410] In loco.

[411] Crum, Dictionary, p. 482a, gives no neuter meaning for OYONNIM.

[412] Horner, Coptic Version in the Southern Dialect, V, 226—227.

[413] Cf. Irenaeus Adv. Haer. 1, 3, 1 (ed. Harvey I, 24sq.).

CONCLUSION

The indications are that The Hypostasis of the Archons is a composite document, consisting of probably two fragments brought together into a whole by an editor. The first of these is of cosmological concern, and takes the form of a Gnostic reinterpretation of the first chapters of Genesis. Its affinities lie with Ophitism, and it is probably the oldest section of the document. The transition to the second main portion is not clear, but the two are bound together by the figure of Norea, who in the former is a mythological figure and in the latter is the recipient of a revelation. This second section is soteriological in its concern, and represents a somewhat later stage in the development of Gnosticism. There are reminiscences of Valentinian doctrine. The editor of the document was a Christian Gnostic, and is responsible for what Christian influence can be seen in the writing. This is evident not only in the beginning and closing, but in parenthetical statements throughout.

Thus the present study raises the problem of literary analysis. Some investigations of literary structure in Gnostic documents have been published already[1]. Such work seems to promise a yield of important evidence for the reconstruction of Gnostic origins and development. When major strata of the tradition can be accurately defined, the evidence of the Church Fathers and the rabbis can be more confidently evaluated, and the amorphous mass of gnostica now available can be structured into a coherent literary and religious history.

As the relation of the document at hand with the untitled document demonstrates, however, literary research does not need to confine itself to single writings. Where associations as close as those of these two writings are evident, relations between documents can be examined with every hope of fruitful results. The association of HA and UW is particularly intriguing, and is awaiting close analysis.

In the course of this study certain associations with Egypt have been noticed. In spite of the fact that most of our knowledge of Gnosticism has been mediated through Egypt if not derived directly from Egyptian soil, there has been a reluctance to consider the contribution made to Gnosticism by native Egyptian lore. Intensified research in this area appears inevitable[2].

[1] E.g., R. McL. Wilson, The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary; Hans-Martin Schenke, Nag Hammadi Studien, ZRGG 14 (1962), 57—63, 263—278, 352—361.

[2] See especially the appeal of Siegfried Morenz, Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann TU 56, Berlin, 1951, pp. 123—125.

This study has had occasion to deal with several excerpts from biblical texts. Research into the Gnostic use of Scripture is needed, not only from the standpoint of interpretation, but of textual history itself. It has already been suggested that Coptic biblical texts may show traces of Gnostic influence[3]. As the study of the Coptic Gnostic writings advances, new material will be available for inquiry into the tantalizing question of a reflection in biblical manuscripts of the struggle between heresy and orthodoxy in Egypt.

Relations of the ideas contained in this document to the mystical literature of later Judaism have only been accorded mention in this study. Much study is being devoted to the tracing of Jewish influence in the formation of Gnosticism. It is becoming evident, however, that the question must be asked of the relation of Gnosticism to the cabbalistic literature. The Nag-Hammadi discovery will provide concrete materials for extensions of Scholem's efforts. Perhaps in this particular area the influence of Graeco-Roman Egypt may prove of significance.

These suggestions for further research seem to be the major areas sensitized by this study. It is to be hoped that this effort will prove of some guidance in further study on The Hypostasis of the Archons, and that the document itself may provide some of the missing pieces to the puzzle of Gnosticism.

---

[3] By Rodolphe Kasser in the introduction to his Papyrus Bodmer III: Evangile de Jean et Genèse I—IV, 2 en bohairique, CSCO 177, pp. xii—xiii, and especially by Eduard Massaux, Quelques variantes importantes de P. Bodmer III et leur accointance avec la gnose, NTS 5 (1959), 210—212.

CONCORDANCE

Coptic Words

AMHЄITN come 135, 24, [33]; 137, 4, 22; 140, 5
AMAƧTЄ : ЄMAƧTЄ catch 136, 1
ANAЄI become better 140, 4
ANOK I 134, 30; 140, 25; 141, 8, 19, 20, 32; 142, 21; 143, 5; 144, 17, 18, 31
APHⲬ- end; MNTAYAPHⲬϤ 142, 4
MNTAϤAPHⲬϤ 145, 8;
MNTЄCAPHⲬϤ 143, 1
Aⲱ what 141, 35; 142, 1

BⲰK go 145, 7
BⲰK work; PBⲰK 140, 30
BAⲖ eye 138, 8; 142, 20
BⲰⲖ release 139, 28
BⲖⲖЄ blind 134, 27; 135, 4 (bis); 142, 26; 145, 6;
MNTBⲖⲖЄ 137, 25

ЄNЄƧ eternity 145, 3, 20 (bis)
ЄPHY each other 137, 4, 21; 140, 5
ЄCHT bottom; ЄПЄCHT 141, 3;
AПЄCHT 142, 11;
ⲱAПЄCHT 142, 31
ЄCOOY : MANЄCOOY shepherd 139, 15
ЄOOY glory 144, 5
ЄⲱⲬЄ if 142, 27
ЄƧOM groan [139, 29]
ЄI come 136, 14; 137, 31; 138, 19; 139, 2; 140, 14;
ЄI ЄBOⲖ ƧN 135, 1; 136, 13, 18; 141, 3; 142, 19;
ЄI ЄBOⲖ M 142, 24;
ЄI ЄƧOYN ⲱA 137, 18;
ЄI ЄⲬN 139, 3;
ЄI ⲱAPO- 140, 21;
I ⲱAPO- 137, 12

ЄIMЄ recognize 138, 17; 140, 9
ЄINЄ bring 137, 4; 139, 15, 17;
INЄ 142, 30;
NT- 136, 21; 137, 7
ЄINЄ image, form 135, 15; 136, 8; 137, [26], 31; 141, 14, 17;
INЄ 135, 13, [31]; 142, 8, 17;
ⲱBPЄINЄ 135, 35; 137, 19; 139, 31; 140, 25
ЄIPЄ do; ЄPI- 141, 1;
P- 134, 31; 135, 3, 4, 26, 30; 136, 1, 25; 137, 23, 25; 138, 8, 22, 31; 139, 10, 13, 26; 140, 3, 4, 11, 19, 30; 141, 5, 26; 142, 21, 23, 25, 32; 143, 7, 15; 145, 6, 13;
O (qual.) 137, 2; 138, 12; 142, 34; 143, 10, 27; 144, 6
ЄIC lo 135, 1; 139, 25;
ЄICƧHHTЄ 144, 15
ЄIⲰT father 134, 21; 135, 22; 136, 11, 34; 143, 4, 16; 144, 12, 17, 20, 35; 145, 15, 18
ЄITN bottom; AПITN 135, 12;
ЄПITN 135, 21, 136, 14;
ⲱAПITN 135, 6;
CAMПITN 135, 19; 142, 10; 143, 13, 21, 22

KЄ other [139, 32];
6Є 136, 6; 142, 22, 27
KOYI small; KOYЄI 140, 13
Kⲱ place 137, 26; 138, 12; 145, 10;
KAA- [136, 25]; 140, 16; 143, 35
KBA vengeance 139, 29
KⲰK AƧHY naked; KHK AƧHY 138, 17, 23
KAKЄ darkness 134, 22; 135, 14; 140, 23; 142, 33
KIM move; KЄIM 136, 17

ⲔⲘⲞⲘ be black; ⲔⲎⲘ 140, 29
ⲔⲚⲦⲈ fig 138, 18
ⲔⲰⲠ hide 138, 23, 24
ⲔⲰⲦ build 137, 9
ⲔⲰⲦⲈ turn; ⲔⲞⲦ- 139, 3, 27; 140, 21, 27, 32
ⲔⲀϩ earth 135, 26, 30; 136, 5, 13 (bis), 17, 20; 139, 13, 30;
ⲠⲘⲚⲔⲀϩ 135, 27; 138, 12
ⲔⲰϩ be jealous 144, 5
ⲔⲰϩ jealousy 144, 6, 8 (bis)
ⲔⲰϩⲦ fire 143, 10

ⲁⲁⲩ someone; ⲘⲚ ⲁⲁⲩ 134, 30; 139, 5; 141, 23

ⲘⲀ place 137, 10; 139, 33; 141, 30
ⲘⲈ love; ⲘⲈⲢⲒⲦ- 135, 14;
ⲘⲈⲢⲈⲒⲦ- 137, 21
ⲘⲈ truth 134, 21; 141, 25; 145, 15
ⲘⲞⲨ die 136, 22; 138, 5, 7; 144, 27
ⲘⲞⲨ death 136, 22; 138, 5, 6; 144, 8 (bis); 145, 7, 13
ⲘⲞⲨⲒ lion; ⲘⲞⲨⲈⲒ 142, 17
ⲘⲔⲀ pain 139, 8
ⲘⲞⲨⲢ bind 143, 11;
ⲘⲞⲢ- 138, 18
ⲘⲢⲢⲈ bond 144, 30
ⲘⲒⲤⲈ give birth 137, 17
ⲘⲎⲦⲈ middle 144, 26
ⲘⲞⲨⲦⲈ call 136, 16, 22; 137, 15; 142, 6; 143, 22, 36
ⲘⲦⲞ presence; ⲘⲠⲈⲘⲦⲞ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ 141, 10;
ⲘⲠⲘⲦⲞ ⲈⲂⲞⲗ 141, 21
ⲘⲘⲀⲨ there 145, 9;
ⲈⲦⲘⲘⲀⲨ 135, 15; 136, 8, 15, 34; 139, 3; 141, 13, 28, 30; 142, 12, 13; 143, 11, 15, 36; 144, 28
ⲘⲀⲁⲨ mother 135, 7; 137, 15, 16; 140, 20, 24, 31; 143, 16
ⲘⲞⲞⲨ water 135, 13, 14, 16, 33; 136, 9
ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ think 141, 22; 143, 2
ⲘⲈⲈⲨⲈ thought 135, 4; 145, 6
ⲘⲞⲨⲞⲨⲦ kill 139, 28
ⲘⲞⲨϩ fill 144, 11;
ⲘⲈϩ- 143, 20;
ⲘⲀϩ- 140, 18

ⲚⲞⲨⲂ gold 141, 15
ⲚⲞⲂⲈ sin 134, 31; 142, 23
ⲚⲒⲘ who, what 136, 10, 22, [28]; 137, 34; 141, 6, 142, 1
ⲚⲒⲘ every 139, 27; 144, 25; 145, [2], 19
ⲚⲞⲨⲚ abyss 135, 7; 143, 13
ⲚⲞⲨⲚⲈ root 141, 24; 145, 15
ⲚⲞⲨⲦⲈ God 134, 30; 135, 3, 32; 136, 2; 138, 9; 139, 18, 21, 24, 33; 140, 34; 141, 5; 142, 22, 26; 143, 5, 23
ⲚⲀⲨ see 135, 16, 35; 136, 12, 22; 137, 2, 13, 19; 142, 20; 143, 14; 144, 4
ⲚⲀⲱⲈ- be many; ⲚⲀⲱⲱ- 143, 29
ⲚⲒⲪⲈ breathe 136, 3; 140, 16; 143, 8
ⲚⲒⲪⲈ breath 143, 9
ⲚⲞⲨϩⲘ save; ⲚⲀϩⲘⲈ- 141, 2, 12
ⲚⲞⲨⲬⲈ cast 135, 4; 137, 22; 144, 30; 145, 5;
ⲚⲞⲨⲬ 139, 7;
ⲚⲞⲬ- 139, 4; 142, 13; 143, 12
ⲚⲞⲃ great 134, 21, 27; 137, 20; 138, 19; 139, 8; 140, 13, 20, 33; 141, 9, 18, 21; 142, 3, 20, 35; 143, 27

ⲠⲈ heaven, sky 136, 21; 140, 13; 142, 8; 143, 20; 144, 10;
ⲠⲎⲨⲈ 141, 3; 144, 10;
ⲤⲀⲚⲦⲠⲈ 135, 10, 20; 140, 26; 142, 9; 143, 22, 24; 144, 2, 13, 21
ⲠⲰⲦ flee 142, 31
ⲠⲈⲦⲚ̀ⲀⲚⲞⲨ good 136, 29; 138, 1, 10
ⲠⲈⲦⲐⲞⲞⲨ evil 136, 30; 138, 1, 10
ⲠⲰϩ reach 134, 32
ⲠⲈⲬⲈ- said 138, 2, 6, 21, 24, 27, 30; 139, 21, 24; 140, 19; 141, 6; 144, 31;
ⲠⲈⲬⲀ- 135, 24, 33; 137, 4, 12, 14, 21; 138, 20; 139, 23, 32, 35; 140, 5, 9, 22, [30]; 141, 4, 8, 18, 19, [32]; 142, 2, 27; 143, 4, 7; 144, 32

ⲢⲰⲔϩ burn; ⲢⲞⲔϩ- 140, 17
ⲢⲒⲘⲈ weep 145, 11
ⲢⲰⲘⲈ man 135, 25, [30]; 136, 4, 12, 15; 139, 2, 7, 9, 33; 140, 2, 3, 7; 144, 27, 33
ⲢⲀⲚ name 136, 16, 23
ⲢⲢⲞ king 141, 26; 145, 5

ϹA side 142, 13;
ϹANTΠϵ 135, 10, 20; 140, 26; 142, 9; 143, 22, 24; 144, 2, 13, 21;
ϹAMΠITN 135, 19; 142, 10; 143, 13, 21, 22;
ϹAN2Pϵ 142, 24;
MMNNϹA 136, 11; 139, 11
ϹABϵ wise; MNTϹABϵ 141, 9
ϹѠBϵ laugh 137, 42
ϹMOY bless 139, 5
ϹMH voice 135, 1; 136, 17; 137, 29; 138, 22; 139, 25; 140, 33; 142, 23; 145, 17
ϹAϵIN physician; ϹOϵIN 137, 16
ϹON brother 139, 21, 22, 24, 26
ϹNAY two 140, 18
ϹNOϤ blood [134, 24]; 139, 25
ϹΠIP rib, side 137, 8, 9
ϹѠT stretch out 142, 29
ϹѠTM hear 138, 22
ϹѠTΠ choose; ϹOTΠ 141, 15
ϹTѠT tremble 139, 30
ϹOOYN know 136, 9, 33; 138, 10, 21, 33;
COYѠN= 139, 13, [30]; 140, 23, 24; 144, 25; 145, 14;
MNTATϹOOYN 134, 28; 137, 6; 138, 16
COYѠN knowledge 136, 29; 138, 1
ϹѠOY2 ϵ2OYN gather 136, 19
ϹѠѠϵ field 139, 16
ϹAѠϤ seven [139, 28]; 143, 3, 20
ϹOO2ϵ set up; Cϵ2Ѡ= 140, 13
ϹOO2ϵ remove; Cϵ2Ѡ= 141, 7
ϹIMϵ woman 135, 28; 137, 8, 11, 17; 138, 2, 13, 28, 30 (bis); [142, 35];
2IMϵ 139, 5, 14
ϹA2OY curse; ϹOYOP- 138, 30;
COY2ѠP- 138, 32;
ϹOYOPT 140, 23
ϹA2OY curse (noun) 139, 2;
ϹA2OYϵ 139, 1, 7

† give 136, 23; 137, 14; 138, 14, [29]; 140, 31;
TAA= 138, 28; 145, 3;
MA- 141, 33

THHBϵ finger 142, 29
TBNH animal 140, 8;
TBNOOYϵ 136, 24; 140, 12
TAKO perish 145, 12;
ATTAKO 144, 22;
MNTATTAKO 135, 1, 2, 20; 136, 18; 141, 29; 142, 5;
MNTATTϵKO 135, 12
TAΛO go aboard; TϵΛO 140, 15
TAMIO create, make 135, 25; 140, 6, 10, 17; 142, 35; 143, 2 (bis), 26;
TAMIO= 142, 1
TAMO instruct; TAMO= [137, 32]; 141, 12; 143, 33; 145, 1
PϤTAMO 137, 32; 138, 6, 11
TѠMT meet 140, 18
TѠN where 138, 20; 139, 22
TANO make; TϵNϵ- 142, 7
TNNOOY send 141, 11;
TNNOOY= 144, 35
TAΠPO mouth 141, 16
†Πϵ Loins 138, 19
THP= all 135, 27; 136, 10, 20, 21, 24; 137, 11; [143, 33]; 144, 10, 11, 12, 13; 145, 13, 17;
ΠTHPϤ [134, 32]; 135, 23; 136, 11; 140, 34; 142, 23; 143, 5; 145, 16, 19
TѠPΠ seize; TOPΠ- 143, 19
TϹABO show; TϹϵBϵ ϵIAT= 141, 33;
TϹϵBO= 144, 15
THY wind; 2ATHOY 136, 7
TOOY mountain 140, 14
TѠOYN arise 137, 13
TOYNOC raise; TOYNOC= 136, 6
TA2O set up; Tϵ2ϵ 135, 15, 18;
Tϵ2O= 135, 34
T2NO approach 144, 23
TѠ2C anoint; TA2C= 145, 2

OYA blasphemy 135, 5
OYA one 144, 9, 10;
ΠOYA ΠOYA 135, 9; 136, 23
OYAA= alone, self 137, 30; 138, 12, 27; 142, 7
OYѠM eat 136, 28, 30, 31; 137, 2, 35; 138, 2, 3, 4; 138, 14, 15, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31
OYOϵIN light 135, 23; [140, 33]; 142, 30, 33; 144, 22; 145, 8, 14
OYN- there is 142, 8, 27;

ⲟⲩⲛⲧⲁ- 135, 28;
ⲙⲛⲧⲉ- 143, 29; 145, 4
ⲟⲩⲟⲛ ⲛⲓⲙ everyone 139, 27; 144, 25; 145, 19
ⲟⲩⲱⲛ open; ⲟⲩⲉⲛ 137, 7; 138, 8, 16; 142, 19
ⲟⲩⲛⲁⲙ right hand 143, 32, [36]
ⲟⲩⲛⲟⲩ hour; ⲛⲧⲉⲩⲛⲟⲩ 141, 2; 142, 28;
ⲧⲉⲛⲟⲩ 141, 13; 144, 28
ⲟⲩⲱⲛϩ reveal, appear 135, 13, 16, 32; 136, 8; 141, 25; 142, 28; 144, 28, 29, [34];
ⲟⲩⲟⲛϩ 135, 11
ⲟⲩⲁⲁⲃ holy 139, 11; 140, 34; 141, 6, 10; 145, 16
ⲟⲩϩⲣ how great 144, 32
ⲟⲩⲱⲧ single 145, 17
ⲟⲩⲱϣ wish 140, 15, 19; 142, 6
ⲟⲩⲱϣ ϣ wish (noun) 135, 22; 136, 11, 34; 144, 12
ⲟⲩϣϩ night 137, 25
ⲟⲩⲱϣ ϣⲃ answer 139, 23
ⲟⲩⲱϩ set 136, 14;
ⲟⲩϩϩ 144, 24
ⲟⲩⲱϩⲙ answer 143, 8

ⲱ become pregnant 139, 14, 31, 34
ⲱⲃϣ forgetfulness : ⲃϣⲉ 137, 5, 6
ⲱⲛϩ live; ⲟⲛϩ 136, 16; 137, 8, 15
ⲱⲛϩ life 137, 14; 144, 3
ⲱⲡ count; ⲏⲡ 144, 19 (bis);
ⲏⲡⲉ 143, 29; 144, 11
ⲱ ϣ cry 141, 4
ⲱϩⲉ stand; ⲁϩⲉ 141, 9, 21
ϣ- be able 135, 15, 17; 136, 5; 141, 14, 16, 24, 28; 144, 23
ϣⲉ wood 140, 10
ϣⲕⲁⲕ cry out 139, 26; 140, 33; 143, 6
ϣⲙⲟⲩⲛⲉ eight 143, 34
ϣⲟⲙⲛⲧⲉ three 144, 29
ϣⲏⲛ tree 136, 27, 29; 137, 34, [35]; 138, [13], 25
ϣⲓⲛⲉ ask 134, 26
ϣⲱⲡ receive; ϣⲟⲡⲛ- 141, 16
ϣⲱⲡⲉ be 136, 4, 10, 15; 137, 10; 138, 9, 21; 139, 1, 9; 139, 29; 140, 28; 141, 34; 142, 8, 11, 12, 14, 16; 143, 9, 26; 144, 1, 3, 6, 7, 12;
ϣⲟⲟⲡ 134, 23; 139, 6, 23; 141, 29; 142, 5, 9, 27; 143, 33; 144, 4, 20, 26; 145, 9
ϣⲉⲉⲣⲉ daughter [139, 34]; 143, 6, 18, 31
ϣⲏⲣⲉ son 135, 8; 139, 12, [31]; 140, 12; 143, 2, 3, 4, 13; 144, 9, 19; 145, 13, 18
ϣⲡⲏ- already 142, 18
ϣⲟⲡⲡ first 144, 20
ϣⲱⲥ shepherd 139, 15
ϣⲧⲟⲣⲧⲣ be troubled 137, 20 (bis)
ϣⲁϫⲉ say, speak 137, 12, 19; 141, 11
ϣⲁϫⲉ speech 134, 32
ϣⲟϫⲛⲉ consider 137, 3; 140, 4, 9
ϣⲱϫⲉ fight 134, 23

ϥⲓ take 135, 29;
ϥⲉⲓ 136, 24;
ϥⲓ- 138, 18; 143, 31;
ϥⲓⲧ- 138, 11; 139, 4
ϥⲧⲟⲟⲩ four 141, 20; 143, 28
ϥⲱⲧⲉ annihilate 140, 7

ϩⲁⲉ end; ϩⲁⲉⲉⲩ 141, 26
ϩⲁⲓ husband 138, 14
ϩⲉ find 135, 11; 136, 17
ϩⲉ kind 137, 1, [141, 34];
ⲛⲑⲉ ⲛ- 136, 7; 137, 8; 138, 9; 140, 28, [31]; 141, 14, 15; 142, 15, 18
ϩⲏ beginning; ⲉϩⲏ 144, 3
ϩⲟ countenance 135, 29; 136, 4; 141, 17; 143, 9
ϩⲱ- self 139, 6; 141, 32; 144, 18
ϩⲓⲉⲓⲃ lamb 139, 18
ϩⲱⲃ thing 136, 25; 139, 13; 142, 7; 145, 2
ϩⲏⲃⲉ grief 145, 13
ϩⲃⲟⲩⲣ left hand 143, 35; [144, 1]
ϩⲁⲓⲃⲉⲥ shadow 137, 26; 138, 32; 142, 11;
ϩⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉⲥ 142, 12, 16;
ϩⲁⲉⲓⲃⲉ 142, 13
ϩⲃⲥⲱ clothing 141, 15
ϩⲁⲗⲏⲧ bird; ϩⲁⲗⲁⲧⲉ 136, 20, 23; 140, 13
ϩⲣⲁⲓ up 142, 4; 144, 24;
ⲉϩⲣⲁⲓ 137, 5, 7, 23; 139, 7, 26; 140, 15; 141, 4, 5, 23; 143, 18, 19; 145, 8;

ϵϩPϵ 140, 16;
ϣA ϩPAI 134, 32; 135, 1
ϩMOOC remain 143, 32
ϩωN command 136, 26; 138, 26
ϩωΠ hide 140, 11;
ϩHΠ 135, 11
ϩATIC it is necessary 140, 30
ϩωPΠ sleep 137, 5, 7
ϩAPϵϩ guard; APϵϩ 136, 26
ϩHT heart; MNTATΘHT 137, 24;
MNTPMNϩHT 141, 19; 142, 3; 142, 20
ϩOTϵ garment 138, 23
ϩωTP unite 142, 7;
ϩATP 135, 22
ϩOOY day 136, 5, 31; 138, 4, 34; [143, 35]
ϩOYT male [135, 28]
ϩOYTCϩIMϵ androgynous 142, 18; 143, 3;
ϩOOYTCϩIMϵ 144, 6
ϩOYϩϵ abortion 142, 15
ϩOϤ snake 138, [31], 32; 139, 1;
ϩAϤ 137, 32; 138, 6, 11; 139, 3
ϩAϩ many 136, 5

XI take 135, 23; 138, 13; 139, 19;
XI- 139, 29; 142, 16
Xω say, tell 135, 2; 136, 27; [137, 33]; 141, 14, 17; 142, 21, 25;
Xϵ- 137, 1; 138, 7; 142, 23;
XOO- 134, 21, 29; 135, 5; 142, 18; 144, 18; 145, 16
XωK fulfil 144, 14
XϵKAAC so that 137, 1
XOΛϵC rot 140, 11
XΠO give birth 139, 12, 14, 31, 32, 34, 35; 144, 8, 9, 16
XOϵIC Lord 141, 33; 144, 18, 32
XICϵ height 144, 5;
XACIϩHT 142, 21;
MNTXACIϩHT 134, 29
Xωϩ touch [136, 31]; 138, 4
XωϩM defile 137, 27 (bis), 28; 140, 3; 141, 28

6ωB weakness; MNT6ωB 135, 17
6ωBϵ leaf 138, 18
6ΛΛϩT pot [140, 29]
6OM might 134, 28; 135, 5, 9; 136, 10; 140, 27; 141, 14, 17, 23;
AT6OM 138, 33;
MNTAT6OM 136, 3, 6
6M6OM be able 141, 24;
6N6OM 135, 15; 136, 5
6ωP6 ambush 136, 8
6ωω)T look 135, 12, 21; 139, 18
6IX hand 140, 7; 141, 2, 12

Greek Words

ἄγγελος angel 141, 2, 9, 13, 18; 142, 3; 143, 10, 11, 14, 28; 145, 11
ἅγιος holy 145, 20 (ter)
ἀδαμαντίνη adamantine 136, 14
ἀδικία unrighteousness 141, 1, 7; 144, 2
ἀθάνατος immortal 144, 26
αἰών aeon 135, 10; 142, 4, 10, 35
ἀλήθεια truth 144, 24, 35; 145, 14, 18
ἀληθινός true 144, 33
ἀλλά but 134, 24; 136, 34; 138, 3; 140, 24, [26]; 144, 27, 28
ἀναχωρεῖν return 142, 32
ἄνομος lawless 141, 12
ἀόρατον invisible 141, 22
ἀπατᾶν lead astray 138, 31; 140, 19
ἀπόστολος apostle 134, 22
ἀριθμός number 144, 14
ἅρμα chariot 143, 27
ἄρχειν rule 140, 3
ἀρχή beginning 144, 7
ἄρχων archon, ruler 135, 23, 27; 136, 19, 26; 137, 3; 138, 19, 24, 30; 140, 4, 8, 19, 22, 27; 141, 1, 7, 23; 142, 34; 144, 16; 145, 23
αὐθάδης arrogant 138, 29; 140, 27; 142, 17
αὐθεντία authority 142, 24
αὐθέντης MNTAYΘϵNTHC arbitrariness 144, 2
αὐξάνειν multiply 140, 4

βίος life 139, 9
βιωτικός preoccupied with life 139, 10
βοήθεια help 136, 18; 140, 1
βοηθεῖν help 141, 1

γάρ for 136, 17; 138, 7, 21; 140, 25, 31; 141, 16, 25, 29
γενεά generation 140, 1 (bis); 141, 28; 144, 29; 145, 4

δαίμων demon 145, 12
δέ but 134, 27 et passim
διὰ τοῦτο therefore 144, 22
δίκαιος righteous 145, 17
διώκειν follow 135, 6; 137, 23; 139, 21
δύναμις force, power, strength 136, 2; 140, 3, 8; 142, 2; 143, 14, 23, 24
δῶρον offering 139, 19 (bis)

εἰ μήτι unless 138, 24
ἐξουσία power 134, 20, 22, 24, 27; 135, 14; 137, 18; 139, 1; 141, 27 (bis), 31, 34; 144, 22, 31; 145, 7, 10
ἔργον work 142, 8, 15; 144, 6
ἔτι still 139, 14

θηρίον animal 135, 29; 136, 20; 142, 17
θυσία sacrifice 139, 17

ἵνα, ϣINA in order that 135, 22; 137, 29; 139, 9; 144, 13

καθιστάναι install 135, 8; 143, 20, 25; 144, 9
καιρός time 141, 26; 145, 11
κακία evil 138, 15
καρπός fruit 139, 16
κατά according to 135, 9 (bis), 31 (bis); 144, 13
καταγινώσκειν condemn 143, 15
κατακλυσμός flood 140, 6
κατακρίνειν condemn 137, 29
καταπατεῖν trample under 145, 6
καταπέτασμα curtain 142, 9, 11; 143, 21
κιβωτός ark 140, 10, 15, 16, 17
κιθάρα cithara 143, 31
κόσμος world 134, 24; 136, 34; 138, 3; 140, 24, [26]; 141, 32; 144, 17, 28

μᾶλλον rather 138, 8
μέγεθος magnitude 143, 1
μέρος region 135, 12, 21; 142, 14, 32
μετανοεῖν repent 143, 15
μή not 139, 23;
μή τι 144, 18;
εἰ μήτι 138, 24
μονή abode 141, 29

νοεῖν think [136, 1]

ὁδός way 144, 25
ὅταν when [144, 33]
ὅτι : ϩOTI because 143, 26
οὐδέ neither 136, 30;
οὔτε [135, 28]; 140, 23; 143, 21
οὐ μόνον not only 138, 3

πάλιν again 139, 13, 34; 140, 17; 142, 33
παράδεισος garden, Paradise 136, 25; [137, 34]; 139, 4
παράδισος 136, 28
παρθενικός virginal 141, 30
παρθένος virgin 140, [1], 2
περισπασμός distraction 139, 8
πλανᾶν lead astray 143, 7;
πλανᾶσθαι 135, 3; 142, 25
πλάνη error 144, 31
πλάσμα creation, creature 135, 34; 136, 1; 137, 30; 138, 34; 144, 34
πλάσσειν form 135, 26, 30
πνεῦμα spirit 134, 20; 136, 12, 13; 139, 11; 141, 6, 10, 22, 30; 144, 24, [35]; 145, 16
πνευματικός spiritual 135, 18;
πνευματική 137, 11, 31;
πνευματικόν 134, 25; 138, 17
πονηρία evil 134, 25
προσκαρτερεῖν persist, attend 136, 7; 139, 10
πρόσωπον face 140, 28; 143, 28

σαρκικός fleshly 139, 20;
σαρκική 138, 2, 13
σάρξ flesh 134, 23; 137, 9; 140, 7
σικχαίνειν : CIXANЄ loathe 143, 17
σπέρμα seed 137, 22; 144, 27; 145, 9
συμβούλιον council 135, 24
σφραγίς seal 137, 28
σχολάζειν have time 139, 10
σῶμα body 135, [26], [28], 31

τέλειος perfect 139, 2
τολμᾶν venture 140, 29; 141, 5
τότε then 138, 19; 140, 3; 145, 5, 10, 13
τύπος type 135, 9; 142, 16; 144, 1, 13, 15

ὕλη matter, material 142, 1, 12, 15, 19, 20, 31, 34; 143, 17; 144, 16, 19
ὑλικός material 137, 3
ὑμνεῖν sing praises 143. 17
ὑπηρετεῖν serve 143, 29
ὑπόστασις hypostasis 134, 20, 26; 141, 35; 145, 22

φθονεῖν be jealous 138, 8
φύλαξ keeper 139, 24
φωστήρ luminary 141, 20

χάος chaos 135, 6; 141, 31; 142, 32; 143, 25; 144, 11, 14
χιών snow 141, 16
χοῦς dust 135, 25, [29]
χρῖσμα : ΧΡΕΙCΜΑ anointing 145, 2
χρόνος time 144, 32

ψαλτήριον harp 143, 30
ψυχή soul 136, 15; 144, 21
ψυχικός psychic 135, 17; 136, 4, 12; 137, 10; 138, 15

Hebrew Words

ΑΜΗΝ 145, 21

ΧΕΡΟΥΒΙΝ 143, 27

Proper Names

ΑΒΕΛ 139, 14 (bis), 16, 19, 21, 22, [33]
ΑΔΑΜ 136, 16, 19, 21, 22, 24; 137, 2, 5, 10, 13, 18; 138, 20, 22, 28; 139, 4, 30, 32
ΕΛΕΛΕΘ 141, 8, 18; 142, 3
ΕΥΖΑ 139, 31, 34; 140, 21, 31
ΖΩΗ 143, 5, 18, 19, 32; 144, 1
ΙΑΛΔΑΒΑΩΘ 143, 11; 144, 3; ΙΑΛΤΑΒΑΩΘ 143, 8
ΚΑΙΝ 139, 12 (bis), 15, 20 (bis), 22, 25; ΚΑΕΙΝ 139, 28
ΝΩΡΕΑ 140, 21, 32 (?); 141, 6; ΩΡΕΑ 140, 14, 32 (?)
ΝΩΖΕ 140, 9
CΑΒΑΩΘ 143, 13, 24
CΑΚΛΑ 143, 7
CΑΜΑΗΛ 135, 3; 142, 25
CΙΡ 140, 44
CΟΦΙΑ 142, 29; 143, 18, 19, 25, 31; ΠΙCΤΙC CΟΦΙΑ 135, 7; 142, 5; 143, 6
ΤΑΡΤΑΡΟΝ 143, 12

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources

Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha vid. Lipsius-Bonnet.

Aelianus, De Natura Animalium, ed. R. Hercher, Leipzig 1864—66.

The Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Revised Standard Version. New York 1957.

Die Apostolischen Väter, Neubearbeitung der Funkschen Ausgabe von K. Bihlmeyer, 1. Teil, Tübingen 1924.

Augustinus, De civitate dei, ed. Dombart-Kalb CC 47. 48, Turnhout, 1955.

—, De genesi ad litteram libri duodecim, ed. J. Zycha CSEL 28, 1, Wien 1894.

The Babylonian Talmud. Translated into English with Notes, Glossary, and Indices under the Editorship of Rabbi Dr. I. Epstein. vol. 33, London 1935—1952.

Baynes, C. A. (ed.) A Coptic Treatise. Cambridge 1933.

Bernardin, J. B., A Coptic Sermon Attributed to St. Athanasius, JThS 38 (1937), 113—129.

Böhlig, A., and Labib, P. (eds.), Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo. Sonderband der Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg 1963.

—, (eds., transs.), Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung No. 58, Berlin 1962.

Charles, R. H. (ed.), The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English, 2 vols. Oxford 1913.

Ciasca, A. (ed.), Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Coptosahidica Musei Borgiani (4 vols) Rome 1885—1889.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Excerpta ex Theodoto, ed. O. Stählin, GCS 17, 103—133, Leipzig 1909.

—, Eclogae propheticae ed. O. Stählin, GCS 17, 135—155, Leipzig 1909.

Crum, W. E. (ed.), Catalogue of the Coptic Manuscripts in the British Museum, London 1905.

De Catanzaro, C. J., (trans.) The Gospel according to Philip, JThS 13 (1962) 35—71.

Diels, H., Kranz, W., Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. 9. Aufl. Berlin, 1960.

Dio Cassius, Historiae Romanae, ed. U. Ph. Boissevain, Berlin 1895—1931, Neudruck 1955.

Diodorus Siculus, Bibliotheca, ed. J. Bekker, L. Dindorf, F. Vogel, Leipzig 1888—1906.

Epiphanius, Panarion, ed. K. Holl, GCS 25. 31. 37, Leipzig 1915—1933.

Eusebius Caesariensis, Historia ecclesiastica, ed. E. Schwartz, GCS 9, 1—3, Leipzig 1903—1908.

—, Praeparatio evangelica, ed. K. Mras, GCS 43, 1—2, Berlin 1954—1956.

The Fathers According to Rabbi Nathan. Translated by Judah Goldin, Yale Judaica Series, Vol. 10, New Haven 1955.

Filastrius Brixiensis, Diversarum Hereseon Liber, ed. F. Heylen, CC 9, 207—324, Turnhout 1957.

Firmicus Maternus, De errore profanarum religionum, ed. K. Ziegler, Das Wort der Antike Bd. III, München 1953.

—, De errore profanarum religionum. Introduzione e commento a cura di Agostino Pastorino. Scrittori Cristiani Greci e Latini; Biblioteca di Studi Superiori, Vol. 27, Firenze 1956.

Ginzā: der Schatz oder das große Buch der Mandäer. Übersetzt und erklärt von Mark Lidzbarski. Quellen der Religionsgeschichte Band 13, Göttingen-Leipzig 1925.

Giversen, S. (ed.), Apocryphon Johannis: the Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction, and Commentary, Acta Theologica Danica, Vol. 5, Copenhagen 1963.

Grobel, K. (trans.), The Gospel of Truth: a Valentinian Meditation on the Gospel, New York and Nashville 1960.

Guillaumont, A., Puech, C. H., Till, W. C., Y. ᶜAbd Al-Masīh, Evangelium nach Thomas, Leiden 1959.

Hegemonius, Acta Archelai, ed. Ch. H. Beeson, GCS 16, Leipzig 1906.

Hennecke, E., Schneemelcher, W., Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung. 2 Bde, 3. Aufl., Tübingen 1959—1964.

Hieronymus, Epistulae, ed. J. Hilberg, CSEL 54—56, Wien 1910—1918.

Hippo vid. Diels-Kranz.

Hippolytus Romanus, Refutatio omnium haeresium, ed. P. Wendland, GCS 26, Leipzig 1916.

The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version. New York 1952.

Horner, G. (ed.), The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic. (4 vols.) Oxford 1898—1905.

—, (ed.), The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic. (7 vols.) Oxford 1911—1924.

Irenaeus Lugdunensis, Adversus haereses, ed. W. W. Harvey, Cambridge 1857. (zitiert mit der Zählung von Stieren)

—, Contre les hérésies, Livre III, ed. F. Sagnard SC 34, Paris 1952.

—, Contre les hérésies, Livre IV, ed. A. Rousseau avec la collab. de B. Hemmerdinger, L. Doutreleau, C. Mercier. SC 100, Paris 1965.

Jacoby, F., Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, Berlin 1923ff.

James, M. Rh. (ed.), The Apocryphal New Testament, Oxford 1953.

Johannes Damascenus, De fide Orthodoxa (M. Lequien) MG 94, 1894.

Josephus, Bellum Judaicum, ed. S. A. Naber, Leipzig 1888—1896.

Justinus Martyr, Dialogus cum Tryphone Judaeo, in: Die ältesten Apologeten, ed. E. J. Goodspeed, Göttingen 1914, 90—265.

Kasser, R. (ed.), Papyrus Bodmer III: Évangile de Jean et Genèse I—IV, 2 en bohairique. CSCO Vol. 177. 178, Scriptores Coptici, Tom. 25. 26, Louvain 1958.

Kautzsch, E. (ed.), Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments, 1. 2, Tübingen 1900.

Kittel, R. (ed.), Biblia Hebraica. 13. Aufl. Stuttgart 1962.

Klijn, A. F. J. (trans.), The Acts of Thomas, Introduction, Text, Commentary, Supplements to Novum Testamentum, Vol. 5, Leiden 1962.

Krause, M., Labib, P. (eds.), Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo, Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band 1, Wiesbaden 1962.

Labib, P., Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, Cairo 1956.

Lagarde, P. de (ed.), Der Pentateuch koptisch, Leipzig 1867.

Leipoldt, J., Schenke, H.-M. (trans.), Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hammadi, Theologische Forschung, Veröffentlichung 20, Hamburg 1960.

Lemm, O. v. (ed.), Sahidische Bibelfragmente III, in: Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, Série 5, Tome 25, No. 4, St.-Pétersbourg 1906.
Lipsius, R. A., Bonnet, M., Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha. (2 vols.), 3. Nachdruck der Ausgabe von 1898, Darmstadt 1959.
Malinine, M., Puech, H. Ch., Quispel, G., Evangelium veritatis, Zürich 1956. Dieselben und W. Till, Evangelium veritatis, Supplementum, Zürich 1961.
Maspero, G. (ed.), Fragments de la version thébaine de l'Ancien Testament, Mémoires publiées par les membres de la Mission Archéologique Française au Caire, Tome 6, Fasc. 1., Paris 1892.
Ménard, J. E. (trans.), L'Évangile selon Philippe, Montréal 1964.
Midrash Rabbah, translated and edited under the direction of I. Epstein (9 vols.), London 1935—1952.
Midrash Tehillim: the Midrash on Psalms, translated by W. G. Braude (2 vols.), Yale Judaica Series, Vol. 13, New Haven 1959.
Morenz, S., Die Geschichte von Joseph dem Zimmermann. TU 56, Berlin 1951.
Naville, E. (trans.), La litanie du soleil: Inscriptions recueillies dans les tombeaux des rois à Thèbes, Leipzig 1875.
Nestle, E., Aland, K. (eds.), Novum Testamentum Graece. 25. Aufl., Stuttgart 1964.
Nock, A. D., Festugière, A. J., Corpus Hermeticum, (4 vols.), 2. Aufl., Paris 1960.
Odeberg, H., 3. Enoch or the Hebrew Book of Enoch, Cambridge 1928.
Origenes, Contra Celsum, ed. P. Koetschau GCS 2—3, Leipzig 1899.
—, De oratione, ed. P. Koetschau GCS 3, Leipzig 1899, 295—403.
Philo Judaeus, Opera, ed. L. Cohn, P. Wendland, S. Reiter, Berlin 1896—1915.
Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer. Translated with introduction and notes by Gerald Friedlander, London 1916.
Plato, Opera, ed. J. Burnet, 2. Aufl. Oxford, 1906—1914, Neudrucke.
Plinius Maior, Naturalis historia, ed. L. v. Jan, Leipzig 1854—65, 2. Aufl. C. Mayhoff, Leipzig 1875—1906.
Plutarchus, Moralia, ed. C. Hubert, W. Nachstädt, W. R. Paton, M. Pohlenz, W. Sievekind, I. Wegehaupt, K. Ziegler, Leipzig 1908ff.
Preuschen, E., Die apokryphen gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht, in: Festgruß Bernhard Stade, Gießen 1900, 162—252.
Pseudoklementinen, ed. B. Rehm, GCS 42. 51, Berlin 1953 and 1965.
Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus omnes haereses, ed. A. Kroymann, CSEL 47, Wien 1906, 213—226 = CC 2, Turnhout 1954, 1399—1410.
Rahlfs; A. (ed.), Septuaginta (2 vols.), 7. Aufl. Stuttgart 1962.
Santos Otero, A. de (ed.), Los Evangelios Apócrifos, Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Vol. 148, Madrid 1961.
Schenke, H.-M. (trans.), Das Wesen der Archonten: eine gnostische Originalschrift aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi, ThLZ 83 (1958), 661—670.
—, (trans.), Vom Ursprung der Welt: eine titellose Abhandlung aus dem Funde von Nag-Hammadi, ThLZ 84 (1959), 243—256.
Schmidt, C., Till, W. C. (trans.), Koptisch-gnostische Schriften, 3. Aufl. GCS 45, Berlin 1962.
Sextus Empiricus, Opera, ed. H. Mutschmann, J. Mau, Leipzig 1912—1954. Indices von K. Janáček, 1954.
Socrates Scholasticus, Historia ecclesiastica, ed. R. Hussey, Oxford 1853.
Tacitus, Opera, ed. C. Hahn, G. Andresen, E. Köstermann, Leipzig 1926—1934.
Tatianus, Oratio ad Graecos, ed. E. Schwartz TU 4, 1, Berlin 1888.

Tertullian, Adversus Judaeos, ed. A. Kroymann CSEL 70, Wien 1942, 251—331; geringfügig verbessert in CC 2, Turnhout 1954, 1339—1396.
—, De carne Christi, ed. A. Kroymann CSEL 70, Wien 1942, 189—250; geringfügig verbessert in CC2, Turnhout 1954, 873—917.
Till, W. C. (ed.), Das Evangelium nach Philippos, PTS 2, Berlin 1963.
—, (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502, TU 60, Berlin 1955.
Völker, W. (ed.), Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis. Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften NF. 5, Tübingen 1932.
Wessely, C., Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts. (4 vols.) Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde 15, Leipzig 1914.
Wilson, R. McL., The Gospel of Philip, translated from the Coptic text with an Introduction and Commentary. New York and Evanston 1962.
Worrell, W. H., "A Coptic Wizard's Hoard," AJSL 46 (1930), 239—262.
The Zohar. Translated by Harry Sperling and Maurice Simon, with an introduction by J. Abelson (5 vols.), London 1931—1934.

Grammatical and Lexicographical Studies

Ast, F. (ed.), Lexikon Platonicum sive Vocum platonicarum Index. (3 vols. in 2.) Reprint of the edition of 1836. Bonn 1956.
Crum, W. E., A Coptic Dictionary. Oxford 1939.
Dalman, G. H. (ed.), Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrash. 2. Aufl., Frankfurt/M. 1922.
Dihle, A., Αὐθέντης, Glotta, 39 (1960), 77—83.
Dörrie, H., Ὑπόστασις: Wort- und Bedeutungsgeschichte. Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen: Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1955, Nr. 3. Göttingen 1955.
Lemm, O. v., Kleine Koptische Studien XIII: ⲔⲰ ⲔⲀϩⲎⲨ oder ⲔⲰⲔ ⲀϩⲎⲨ? Bulletin de l'Académie Impériale des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg, V, 13. St.-Pétersbourg 1900.
Liddell, H. G., and Scott, R. (eds.), A Greek-English Lexicon. 9th ed., revised and augmented throughout by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie. Oxford 1958.
Mallon, A., Grammaire copte: bibliographie, chrestomathie et vocabulaire. 4. durchgesehene Auflage von Michel Malinine. Beirut 1956.
Nilsson, M. P., Sophia-Prunikos, Eranos: Acta Philologica Suecana, 45 (1947), 169 to 172.
Plumley, J. M., An Introductory Coptic Grammar (Sahidic Dialect). London 1948.
Preisigke, F. (ed.), Namenbuch, enthaltend alle griechischen, lateinischen, ägyptischen, hebräischen, arabischen und sonstige semitischen und nichtsemitischen Menschennamen soweit sie in griechischen Urkunden (Papyri, Ostraka, Inschriften, Mumienschildern usw.) Ägyptens sich vorfinden. Heidelberg 1922.
Scholem, G., Über eine Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften und ihren jüdischen Ursprung, ZNW 30 (1931), 170—176.
Sethe, K., Das Verhältnis zwischen Demotisch und Koptisch und seine Lehren für die Geschichte der ägyptischen Sprache. Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, NF. 4 (1925), 290—316.
Sophocles, E. A., Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Period (2 vols.), New York 1957.

Stegemann, V., Koptische Paläographie: 25 Tafeln zur Veranschaulichung der Schreibstile koptischer Schriftdenkmäler auf Papyrus, Pergament und Papier für die Zeit des III.—XIV. Jahrhunderts, mit einem Versuch einer Stilgeschichte der koptischen Schrift. (Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums und des Mittelalters, Reihe C; Hilfsbücher, Band I). Heidelberg: Selbstverlag von F. Bilabel, 1936.

Steindorff, G., Lehrbuch der koptischen Grammatik, Chicago 1951.

Till, W. C., Koptische Dialektgrammatik mit Lesestücken und Wörterbuch. 2., neugestaltete Auflage, München 1961.

—, Koptische Grammatik (Saidischer Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen. 2., verbesserte Aufl. (Lehrbücher für das Studium der orientalischen Sprachen, Band I). Leipzig 1961.

Witt, R. E., ΥΠΟΣΤΑΣΙΣ in: Amicitiae Corolla: a Volume of Essays presented to James Rendel Harris, edited by H. G. Wood, London 1933, 319—343.

Other Secondary Sources

Aleith, E., Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche. BZNW 18, Berlin 1937.

Altmann, A., The Gnostic Background of the Rabbinic Adam Legend. Jewish Quarterly Review 35 (1944—1945), 371—391.

Amann, E., s. v. Ophites, in: DThC XI/1 (1931), 1063—1075.

Aptowitzer, V., Kain und Abel in der Agada, den Apokryphen, der hellenistischen, christlichen und mohammedanischen Literatur. Veröffentlichungen der Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation I, Wien-Leipzig 1922.

Armstrong, G. T., Die Genesis in der alten Kirche: die drei Kirchenväter. Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Hermeneutik IV, Tübingen 1962.

Baudissin, W. W., Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte. (2 vols.). Leipzig 1876—1878.

Baxmann, R., Die Philosophumena und die Peraten, eine Untersuchung aus der alten Häresiologie, ZHTh 30 (1860), 218—257.

Bell, H. I., Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt. Liverpool 1953.

Benz, E., Adam: der Mythus vom Urmenschen. München 1955.

Bertholet, A., Das Geschlecht der Gottheit. SGV 173, Tübingen 1934.

Betz, O., Was am Anfang geschah (das jüdische Erbe in den neugefundenen koptisch-gnostischen Schriften), in: Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen in Gespräch über die Bibel; Festschrift für Otto Michel zum 60. Geburtstag. = Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums, Vol. V. Leiden 1963.

Bietenhard, H., Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum. WUNT 2, Tübingen 1951.

Blau, L., s. v. Samael. JewEnc X (1905), 665—666.

Böklen, E. A., Adam und Qain im Lichte der vergleichenden Mythenforschung. Mythologische Bibliothek, Band I, Heft 2—3. Leipzig 1907.

Bonner, C., An Amulet of the Ophite Gnostics, in: Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear. Hesperia Suppl. 8, Athen 1949.

—, Studies in Magical Amulets, chiefly Graeco-Egyptian. University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series, Vol. 49, Ann Arbor 1950.

Bonnet, H., Reallexikon der ägyptischen Religionsgeschichte. Berlin 1952.

Bornkamm, G., Mythos und Legende in den apokryphen Thomas-Akten: Beiträge zur Geschichte der Gnosis und zur Vorgeschichte des Manichäismus. FRLANT NF. 31, Göttingen 1933.

—, s. v. Ophiten, in: PW XVIII/1, col. 654—658.
Bousset, W., s. v. Gnosis, in: PW VII, col. 1503—1533.
—, s. v. Gnostiker, in: PW VII, col. 1534—1547.
—, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis. FRLANT 10, Göttingen 1907.
Budge, E. A. W., Egyptian Magic, Books on Egypt and Chaldea, Vol. II, London 1901.
Bultmann, R., Das Evangelium des Johannes. MeyerK, 17. Aufl. Göttingen 1962.
Burkitt, F. C., Pistis Sophia, JThS 23 (1922), 271—280.
Burmester, O. H. E., Egyptian Mythology in the Coptic Apocrypha, Or 7 (1938), 355—367.
Cary, M. et al. (eds.), The Oxford Classical Dictionary. Oxford 1949.
Casey, R. P., Naassenes and Ophites, JThS 27 (1926), 374—387.
Clemen, C., Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos. MV(Ä)G 43, 3. Leipzig 1939.
Cornélis, E. M. J. M., Quelques éléments pour une comparaison entre l'Évangile de Thomas et la notice d'Hippolyte sur les Naassènes, VigChr. 15 (1961), 83—104.
Cornford, F. M., Plato's Cosmology: the Timaeus of Plato translated with a running Commentary. London 1937.
Cramer, M., Das christlich-koptische Ägypten einst und heute: eine Orientierung. Wiesbaden 1959.
Cumont, F., The Mysteries of Mithra. Translated from the second revised French edition by Thomas J. McCormack. Chicago 1903.
Deissmann, A., Light from the Ancient East: the New Testament illustrated by recently discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World. Translated by Lionel R. M. Strachan. 2nd ed., New York and London 1911.
Delcourt, M., Hermaphrodite: mythes et rites de la bisexualité dans l'antiquité classique. MR 36, Paris 1958.
Dietrich, E. L., Der Urmensch als Androgyn, ZKG 58 (1939), 297—345.
Dodd, C. H., The Bible and the Greeks. London 1935.
Doresse, J., Nouveaux aperçus historiques sur les Gnostiques coptes: Ophites et Séthiens, Bulletin de l'Institut d'Égypte 31 (1949), 409—419.
—, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics. Translated by Philip Mairet. New York 1960.
Drexler, W., s. v. Horaios, in: Roscher, I/2 col. 2741.
Drower, E. St., The Secret Adam: A Study of Nasorean Gnosis. Oxford 1960.
Dudley, L., The Egyptian Elements in the Legend of the Body and Soul, Baltimore 1911.
Edgar, C. C., More Tombstones from Tell el Yehoudiyeh, ASAE 22 (1922), 7—16.
Erman, A., Heidnisches bei den Kopten, ZÄS 33 (1895), 47—51.
Frend, W. H. C., The Gnostic-Manichean Tradition in Roman North Africa, JEH 4 (1953), 13—26.
Freudenthal, J., Hellenistische Studien (2 vols.), Breslau 1875—1879.
Friedländer, M., Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus, Göttingen 1898.
Fuchs, L., Die Juden Ägyptens in ptolemäischer und römischer Zeit. Veröffentlichungen der Dr. A. S. Bettelheim Memorial Foundation. Wien 1924.
Gaster, M., s. v. Magic (Jewish), in: ERE VIII (1926), 300—305.
Gerhard, E., Ueber Agathodaimon und Bona Dea, Gesammelte Akademische Abhandlungen und Kleine Schriften (2 vols.), Berlin 1866—1868, II, 21—57.
Ginzberg, L., The Legends of the Jews. Translated from the German manuscript by Henrietta Szold (7 vols.), Philadelphia 1909—1938.
Giversen, S., The Apocryphon of John and Genesis, StTh 17 (1963), 60—76.

—, Nag Hammadi Bibliography: 1948—1963, StTh 17 (1963), 139—187.
Goodenough, E. R., A Jewish-Gnostic Amulet of the Roman Period, Greek and Byzantine Studies, I (1958), 71—80.
—, Jewish Symbols in the Greco-Roman Period (8 vols.), Bollingen Series, New York 1953—1958.
Güdemann, M., Religionsgeschichtliche Studien. Schriften des israelitischen Literatur-Vereins, Jahrgang II. Leipzig 1876.
Hartmann, L. M., s. v. Schlange (Mythologie, Kult), in: PW Reihe II, Band II (1923), col. 508—514.
Jastrow, M., Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens (2 vols. in 3), Gießen 1905—1912.
Jeremias, A., Das Alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients. 4. durchges. Aufl., Leipzig 1930.
Jervell, J., Imago Dei: Gen. 1, 26f. im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen. FRLANT NF. 58, Göttingen 1960.
Jessen, O., s. v. Hermaphroditos, in: PW VIII, col. 714—721.
Jonas, H., Gnosis und spätantiker Geist. Teil I: Die mythologische Gnosis. 3. Aufl. FRLANT NF. 33, Göttingen 1964.
—, The Gnostic Religion: the Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity, 2nd ed. rev., Boston 1963.
Klijn, A. F. J., The 'Single One' in the Gospel of Thomas, JBL 81 (1962), 271—278.
Knox, W. L., The Divine Wisdom, JThS 38 (1937), 230—237.
—, St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles. Cambridge 1961.
Köhler, R., Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams. Germania VII (1862), 476—480.
Krappe, A., The Birth of Eve, in: Occident and Orient . . . Gaster Anniversary Volume, ed. Bruno Schneider, London 1936, 312—322.
Legge, F., Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity (2 vols.), Cambridge 1915.
Lehmann-Hartleben, K., Olsen, E. C., Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore. Baltimore (Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and the Trustees of the Walters Art Gallery), 1942.
Leipoldt, J., Entstehung der koptischen Kirche, R. Haupts Katalog für Ägyptologie und koptische Sprache und Literatur V (1905), 1—13.
Leisegang, H., Die Gnosis. Kröners Taschenausgabe, Band 32, Leipzig 1924.
—, Das Mysterium der Schlange: ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des griechischen Mysterienkultes und seines Fortlebens in der christlichen Welt, ErJb 7 (1940), 151—250.
Löw, I., Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams. ZNW 11 (1910), 168.
MacCulloch, J. A., s. v. Earth, Earth-Gods, in: ERE V, 127—131.
Massaux, E., Quelques variantes importantes de P. Bodmer III et leur accointance avec la gnose. NTS 5 (1959), 210—212.
Mercer, S. A. B., The Religion of Ancient Egypt. London 1949.
Meyer, R., Hellenistisches in der rabbinischen Anthropologie: rabbinische Vorstellungen vom Werden des Menschen. BWA(N)T Reihe IV, Band XXII. Stuttgart 1937.
Miegge, G., The Virgin Mary: the Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine. Translated by Waldo Smith. Philadelphia 1955.
Murray, G., Five Stages of Greek Religion. Boston 1951.
Nestle, E., Die 'jungfräuliche' Erde, ARW 11 (1908), 414—416.
Nilsson, M., Geschichte der griechischen Religion. Band II: Die hellenistische und römische Zeit. HAW V, 2, 2. München 1950.
Nock, A. D., Later Egyptian Piety, in: Coptic Egypt, New York, Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences, The Brooklyn Museum, 1944, 21—29.

Orbe, A., A propósito de Gen 1, 3 (fiat lux) en la exegesis de Taciano, Gregorianum 42 (1961), 401—443.
Peterson, E., La Libération d'Adam de l''Ανάγκη. RB 55 (1948), 199—214.
—, s. v. Ofiti, in: EC IX (1952), 80—81.
Peuckert, W.-E., Astrologie, in: Geschichte der Geheimwissenschaften, Band I, Stuttgart 1960.
Pietschmann, R. s. v. Asklepios (2), in: PW II (1896), col. 1642—1697.
Porter, F. Ch., The Pre-existence of the Soul in the Book of Wisdom and in the Rabbinical Writings, in: Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper, ed. R. F. Harper u. a., (2 vols.), Chicago 1908, I, 207—269.
Procope-Walter, A., Jao und Seth, ARW 30 (1933), 34—69.
Puech, H.-Ch., s. v. Archontiker, in: RAC I (1950), 633—643.
—, Fragments retrouvés de l'«Apocalypse d'Allogène», in: Mélanges Franz Cumont, AJPh IV (2 vols.), Bruxelles 1936, II, 935—962.
—, Le Manichéisme: son fondateur, sa doctrine. Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque de Diffusion 56, Paris 1949.
—, Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte (premier inventaire et essai d'identification), in: Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum, Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute No. 2. Boston 1950, 91—154.
Quasten, J., Patrology (3 vols.), Utrecht and Antwerp 1963.
Quispel, G., Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie. EvTh 14 (1954), 474—484.
—, Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition. ErJb 22 (1954), 195—234.
Reinach, S., La naissance d'Ève. RHR 78 (1918), 185—206.
Reitzenstein, R., Poimandres: Studien zur griechisch-ägyptischen und frühchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig 1904.
Roeder, G., s. v. Isis, in: PW IX (1916), col. 2084—2132.
—, Mythen und Legenden um ägyptische Gottheiten und Pharaonen. Die ägyptische Religion in Texten und Bildern, Band II. Zürich-Stuttgart 1960.
Rudolph, K., Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch-Adam-Spekulation, ZRGG 9 (1957), 1—20.
—, Die Mandäer. Teil I Prolegomena: das Mandäerproblem. FRLANT NF. 56, Göttingen 1960.
Sachs, M., Beiträge zur Sprach- und Altertumsforschung aus jüdischen Quellen (2 vols.), Berlin 1852—1854.
Saglio, E., s. v. Agathodaimon, in: Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments, ed. C. Daremberg and E. Saglio, I/1 (1877), 131.
Schenke, H.-M., Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis, ein religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi. Göttingen 1962.
—, Nag-Hamadi Studien I: das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis, ZRGG 14 (1962), 57—63.
—, Nag-Hamadi Studien II: das System der Sophia Jesu Christi, ZRGG 14 (1962), 263—278.
—, Nag-Hamadi Studien III: die Spitze des dem Apokryphon Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrunde liegenden gnostischen Systems, ZRGG 14 (1962), 352—361.
Schlier, H., Der Brief an die Epheser: ein Kommentar. 4. Aufl. Düsseldorf 1963.
—, Der Mensch im Gnostizismus. Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen) 2: Anthropologie religieuse, l'homme et sa destinée à la lumière de l'histoire des religions, ed. C. J. Bleeker, Leiden 1955, pp. 60—76.

Schoedel, W. R., Naassene Themes in the Coptic Gospel of Thomas. VigChr 14 (1960), 224—234.
Scholem, G., Jewish Gnosticism, Merkabah Mysticism, and Talmudic Tradition. New York 1960.
—, Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism. New York 1961.
—, Die Vorstellung von Golem in ihren tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen. ErJb 22 (1954), 235—289.
Schwally, R., Die biblischen Schöpfungsberichte. ARW 9 (1906), 159—175.
Scott, E. F., s. v. Ophitism, in: ERE IX, 499—501.
Scott-Moncrieff, P. D., Gnosticism and early Christianity in Egypt, ChQR 69 (1909 to 1910), 64—84.
—, Paganism and Christianity in Egypt. Cambridge 1913.
Segelberg, E., The Coptic-Gnostic Gospel according to Philip and its Sacramental Theology. Numen 7 (1960), 189—200.
Simon, M., Sur deux héresies juives mentionnées par Justin Martyr. RHPhR 18 (1938), 54—58.
Theiler, W., Gott und Seele im kaiserzeitlichen Denken, in: Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne, Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, No. 3; Verona 1957, 74—99.
Till, W. C., Coptic Biblical Texts published after Vaschalde's lists. BJRL 42 (1959), 220—240.
—, The Gnostic Apocryphon of John. JEH 3 (1952), 14—22.
Torhoudt, A., Een onbekend Gnostisch Systeem in Plutarchus' De Iside et Osiride. Studia Hellenistica I. Louvain 1942.
Troje, L., ΑΔΑΜ und ΖΩΗ; eine Szene der altchristlichen Kunst in ihrem religionsgeschichtlichen Zusammenhange. SAH Phil.-hist. Klasse VII, Heidelberg 1916.
Van Unnik, W. C., Die jüdische Komponente in der Entstehung der Gnosis. VigChr 15 (1961), 65—82.
—, Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings: a preliminary Survey of the Nag Hammadi Find. Studies in Biblical Theology 30, Napierville/Ill. 1960.
Vaschalde, A., Ce qui a été publiée des versions coptes de la Bible. RB 16 (1919), 220—243.
Vollmer, H., Die Erde als jungfräuliche Mutter Adams. ZNW 10 (1909), 323.
Wilson, R. McL., The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1. 26, in: Studia Patristica, ed. K. Aland and F. L. Cross (4 vols.); TU 63, 420—437.
—, The Gnostic Problem: a Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy. London 1958.
—, The New Testament in the Gnostic Gospel of Mary. NTS 3 (1957), 236—243.
Zandee, J., Death as an Enemy according to Ancient Egyptian Conceptions. Studies in the History of Religions 5, Leiden 1960.
—, Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation. Numen 11 (1964), 13—74.
Ziegler, K., Menschen- und Weltenwerden. Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte und deutsche Literatur 31 (1913), 529—573.
Zimmermann, F., Koptisches Christentum und altägyptische Religion. ThQ 96 (1912), 592—604.

Correspondence

Wilson, Robert McL., Personal letter to the writer, dated April 7, 1965.